

THE
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE
AND
MONTHLY REVIEW.

VOL. XLIX. — MARCH, 1873. — No. 3.

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS.

BY THE EDITOR.

IN the treatment of this subject, two points require to be considered ; first, the claim which Christian institutions have upon us, and, second, the place which they should hold in a Christian Commonwealth. The second of these points we shall here consider only so far as it may be involved in the first.

Why should we cherish and sustain religious institutions ? In themselves they are nothing. The life, the spirit, are all. Why not confine ourselves to them ? These questions are often asked. The reply is a simple one. Life, so far as we know anything about it, is always connected with some sort of an organization, without which it cannot be developed. In raising corn, the kernel is the only thing that we can use to much advantage. But in order to get the kernel, we have to cultivate the ground, and raise the leaf, the stalk and the husk, from which at last we separate the corn. It is the kernel alone that we want ; but because we want it, we

are obliged to attend to the processes by which the living fruitful organism is to be produced. The earth must be turned up, the sun must shine and rains descend, the roots must reach down into the ground, the husks must fold themselves softly around the tender ear while it is yet hardly formed, that so the needed protection may be given, and the juices which are essential to the nutriment of the kernel may be prepared. The moment we strip off all that is apparently extraneous, and without value in itself, that moment we derange and destroy the life-giving processes by which the grain itself is formed. All life involves, as essential to its growth, a wonderful organization—a system of means external to itself, and, to the superficial eye, apparently without use.

It is so in the growth of the soul. A purely spiritual worship through which the life of God flows into it—a practical faith by which a life of justice and charity to man is sustained—these are all that are essential. But how are these to be sustained? Can they, without form or outward array of means, perpetuate themselves? Will they spontaneously plant themselves in the individual mind, and grow up as the life of its life without aid from abroad? Or do they need the fostering care of a Christian home, the earliest and best of religious institutions? And is the home sufficient to itself, or do the parents who are most earnest to promote the religious life of their children need the aid of public worship, with its more impressive forms, to help along the inward life of the child, and strengthen the sentiment of reverence in its heart? May not the Sabbath with its peaceful withdrawal from toil, and the church with its simple and touching rites, the congregation, the prayer, the hymns of praise, all come in to foster the young and tender sentiment of piety in the soul of the child? As he grows up, will not these same influences help to shield that precious life of the soul from the skeptical and hardening influences of society? May not the simple forms of worship, with their sacred and delicate associations, fold themselves round his religious life, to protect and shelter it, as the soft and delicate husks enclose the tender ear, and

guard it from wind and sun? These religious institutions and rites are not religion — they have no value in themselves — but they help to protect and foster the sentiment of reverence in the soul, and to make it a power in the life of the individual and the world.

We would not substitute the forms of religion for religion itself, as too often has been done. But we would have our religion condescend, as God himself does, to meet the necessities and weaknesses of our human nature and condition.

As the soul of man is more than the body, so is the spirit of our religion more than its institutions. As man's body is more than raiment, so is the substance of our religion more than its forms. But as the soul of man cannot be sustained in this world without a body, and as the body can hardly be sustained without raiment; so the spirit and the substance of our religion can hardly be kept permanently alive in the world without institutions and forms. *Men die; but institutions live.* A man brings a higher type of thought and life into the world, and passes away. But if that higher type of thought and life has been embodied in an institution, it lives on in that, and by means of it diffuses itself through coming generations. It enters into men's souls, gives consistency to their characters, and regulates their conduct. When great men are raised up to enlarge the intellectual resources of the race, to quicken their religious sensibilities or their powers of active beneficence, then new institutions are formed, or old institutions are changed through the new and vitalizing energy that is infused into them. The men die. But their ideas have embodied themselves in public institutions, and go down for ages among the beneficent activities of the world. It is so in small things and in great. John M'Lane, a wealthy Boston merchant, founded a hospital for the insane, and in that hospital for alleviating or removing one of the most frightful forms of human suffering, his work of charity has been going on for more than half a century, and will continue to go on for ages yet to come. His thought embodied itself in an institution, and that institution not merely carries down his idea from age to age, but, through instrumentalities

endowed by him, it draws to itself from each new generation and embodies as a part of its own beneficent life and agencies all the improved appliances and methods of treatment, which may be serviceable to that unfortunate class of sufferers.

It is in this way that we keep what we have once gained, and go on making new and permanent additions. The highest thought or life of to-day embodying itself in a church, a law, a school, or an association, infuses itself through kindred institutions, adding indefinitely to their efficiency, and thus becomes an organic and self-perpetuating influence in the community. An institution, wisely founded and wisely conducted, may contain within itself the accumulated wisdom and charity of centuries, taking up into itself the best life and thought of each new generation, and handing them on to new generations. The Sabbath and the church—they have come down to us through eighteen centuries, freighted with holy thoughts and memories, perfumed with affections and prayers, reaching upward to the throne of God, and onward to generations yet unborn. Surely it is something to be brought into living sympathy and communion with the past and the future through institutions like these, which lift us above the cares and excitements of the hour, and give us our place as actors in the endless procession of souls who are marching on from earth to heaven? We, creatures of a day upon earth, are yet immortal members of this undying community of souls!

There is an inward spirit, the one essential thing in our religion, but it must embody itself in institutions, and perpetuate itself through them. He who has the most of the spirit and life will most honor the forms which best express and perpetuate that spirit and life; just as he who has most of the spirit of friendship in his heart will be most earnest to show his friend every outward mark or form of friendship. If the form be a true one, it not only borrows life from the spirit of the religion, but it reacts upon and strengthens that spirit. The spirit of devotion in the heart, instead of withdrawing us from all forms of worship and making them superfluous, endows those forms with new life and increases

their power over us. There are exceptions. But as a general rule we believe it is true that they who are most earnest and constant in their private devotions are those who most earnestly and constantly seek the aids of public worship. Usually it is not the spirit of prayer in the soul, but the lack of it, that keeps men away from the sanctuary. The sentiment of friendship in the heart makes the duties of friendship agreeable to us; and the performance of those duties increases the interest we take in our friend. So the spirit of devotion in the heart, instead of keeping us away from forms of worship and making them superfluous and burdensome, prepares us to engage in them with interest and profit, and our engaging in them increases the spirit of devotion in us.

The great mistake in superstitious times and churches has been to exaggerate and deify the forms of religion. They cease to be regarded as means to an end, and are viewed with superstitious reverence as endowed with a sanctity and a value of their own. Thus prayer becomes a sort of incantation. Baptism is a species of priestly legerdemain by which the soul of the unconscious child is transferred from the dominion of darkness to that of light. The sacrament is a charm, and the church, independently of the dispositions of mind with which men enter it, is made a sort of enchanted castle where evil spirits cannot come. The central precepts of our religion, the simple doctrines of love to God and love to man, which Jesus so earnestly insists upon, are stifled amid priestly forms and ceremonies.

There has been with us, naturally enough, a violent reaction from all this, and a disposition to regard religious forms as medicine for the sick rather than as food for the strong, as something pardonable to weakness and early habits of education, rather than as helps to a manly, athletic piety.

But are we prepared to give up all religious forms and ordinances—all institutions of religious instruction and worship? Amid the labors and distracting interests of life, do we not need them as visible monitors to remind us of our allegiance to God and better things? In the rapidly succeeding generations of men, each child born in utter igno-

rance of God and of all that has gone before, do we not need them to perpetuate from age to age not only the doctrines, but the life of our religion? Do we not need the Sabbath with its solemn pause amid the week-day labors of the world, not only to cool our heated ambition, and lift our thoughts above the things of time, but still more for the sake of our children, that in our churches the sentiment of reverence may be cherished, and that the opening affections, in all their tenderness and delicacy, may be enfolded in an atmosphere of religious life and love?

In some cases, through peculiar influences at home, the want might be supplied. And yet, as a general rule, those are the homes which most seek the aid of the Sabbath and the sanctuary. Men die; but institutions live. Parents and teachers die; but the Sabbath and the church live on from generation to generation, consecrating the child with the waters of a Christian baptism, and taking it up within the sphere of their holy influences and impressions. The men whom we reverence most, the great moral teachers and benefactors of society, pass away, but the forms of government which they established or sustained, the schools and hospitals which they founded or enriched, the Sabbath and the church to which they acknowledged their obligations for what was purest and best in their culture, — these live on. They reach out their fostering hand, to draw in every child that is born and to train it up with parental thoughtfulness and love in all just and humane sentiments, in the love of man and the worship of God. We shall soon pass away, as our fathers have done before us; but if we would not utterly die, let us do what we can to give power, for good and not for evil, to the institutions which shall live when we are dead, and which, like ships sailing over the sea of time, carry with them to each new generation the highest intelligence, the holiest life, the most thoughtful beneficence, the sweetest affections and the most fragrant devotions from all the generations that have gone before. The pastor of a Christian church does not stand alone — an isolated human being of to-day — speaking from the solitary recesses of his own spirit

in his own name alone. He is the successor and representative of all who have gone before him—the successor and representative of that long line of holy men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, teachers and pastors, who have come down through the ages bearing with them the ark of God. He must die; but the church will live, the Sabbath will live, and diffuse their gentle and mighty influences for good.

The amount of what we have said is this. There is no permanent self-perpetuating life in this world without an external organization. The principle of animal or vegetable life vanishes away the moment it is divested of the organic form with which it is connected. So in our human life, unless a beneficent idea lives on in an institution or a book which is an institution, it is likely to vanish away. A rich man's kind deeds flow through the community, and his death is dreaded as a public calamity. But he endows a school or hospital, and thus his beneficence lives on for centuries. It is embodied in an institution, and thus made immortal. An earnest, devout man gathers poor children from the lanes and hovels of a city on Sundays in order to instruct them in their moral and religious duties. He dies; but his idea has shaped itself into an institution; and that institution—the Sabbath school—with the expansive energy which belongs to a great Christian sentiment, extends itself, far beyond any hope or thought of his, into distant lands and ages. A kind-hearted, thoughtful man tries to assist a few deaf and dumb people, and open a medium of communication between them and their friends. He succeeds. But his idea does not perish with him. He has taught his system to others. They improve upon it. It is embodied in an institution, and becomes a permanent part of the wealth of every enlightened and Christian community—practically opening the ears of the deaf, and loosing the tongues of the dumb. In every one of these cases, unless the idea had been embodied and perpetuated in an institution, it would have been hardly more than a transient impulse, vibrating a little while in the atmosphere of society, and then passing away,—as fleeting here as the human life from which it sprang.

The best institutions are an outgrowth from the inward thought and life. There are many who regard them as arbitrary mechanisms, devised and made up by men, and therefore, to be altered or removed at pleasure. Undoubtedly there are institutions and forms which have been thus arbitrarily established, and which may, therefore, be changed or destroyed at pleasure. But the central institutions of society have come to be what they are by a slow and natural growth. They have been taking up into themselves from age to age the prevailing ideas and sentiments. These ideas and sentiments are their nutriment, and only by changing *them* can the institutions themselves be changed.

Even the Roman Catholic Church, in some respects the most unnatural institution that burdens the heart of Christendom, has been the growth, through sixteen centuries, of the ideas and sentiments which have prevailed within its limits. Men cannot essentially alter the institution, or destroy any one of its forms without touching to the quick some living sentiment or belief out of which it has sprung. If the religious thought and life of the Roman Catholic community should be changed, the forms must soon change with them. They must adapt themselves, as they always have done, to the ideas and convictions of those by whom and for whom they are made. But with the consummate art belonging to that church forms are so constituted as to perpetuate the ideas from which they come. They have been organized with such symmetrical and granitic force around the souls of men, they so subdue the mind of the child to their own mood and keep it there, they have so adapted themselves to human weaknesses, they so appeal to the low, idolatrous elements of man's nature, while they seem to make provision for whatever is most disinterested and holy, that they shut up the soul itself within their massive and immovable barriers and thus perpetuate the very ignorance and superstition out of which they have sprung. It is the most stupendous system of despotism that ever overawed and stifled the life and freedom of the world. If it should ever gain the ascendancy in this country, and have power to exercise the authority which

it claims, then farewell to all free institutions, and to all hopes for the political or moral regeneration of the world. But it is not to be overthrown by maledictions and mobs, by the breaking of images, the burning of convents, or the spasmodic efforts of any ephemeral party that may be raised up out of hatred against it. Such measures increase its power, and give it a firmer grasp on the souls of its victims. Only by the slow but steadfast progress of intellectual and religious life, manifesting itself under free institutions of government and religion, gradually emancipating individual minds, and through them lighting up, one after another, the dark places of the church, can the old and terrible despotism be made to relax its hold on the souls of its victims.

We have spoken of institutions as an organic growth. They form themselves around the moral and religious convictions of the world as their natural expression and embodiments. It is through institutions more than in all other ways that these convictions instil themselves into the minds of the young and mould their characters whether, for good or for evil. It is thus that governments are formed, and that laws are made which almost execute themselves. The most effective institution in the world on a large scale, is the Roman Catholic Church. But the same power which it exercises for many good ends, but also for the religious enslavement of men, may be exercised on the side of religious truth and freedom by institutions which are the natural outgrowth of Christian sentiments, if we are only true to those sentiments. We undervalue the efficacy of religious institutions, and therefore lose one of the most effective agencies that God has ever appointed for the religious education of mankind. It is from this point that we wish to speak of the Christian church as an institution divinely ordained and endowed for the spiritual renovation and advancement of the race.

The idea, like that which always reveals itself in the works of God, is a simple one. Jesus Christ came into the world, gave expression to his great and saving truths, performed his mighty works, lived his divine life, breathed his spirit into the souls of his followers, and then withdrew from human sight.

He left not even a book in which his instructions were embodied. But the new life which he had created, with the great ideas connected with it, shaped itself, as a deep and central life always will, into a body with its various members. The Christian church grew as naturally out of the gospel of Christ as the oak from the acorn. Had there been no vital organization, repeating and perpetuating itself wherever two or three were gathered together in his name, with Him in the midst of them, his religion would have made no very powerful impression on the world. But here were living organizations, endowed with all the elements of a divine life, springing up wherever the gospel was preached, to extend and perpetuate its truths, its spirit, and its soul-sustaining energy. Every Christian body with its frequent meetings, its simple but expressive rites of baptism and the Lord's Supper, drawing believers together as brethren, and uniting all to Christ as their head, was in itself a complete organization, having all the means of spiritual training within itself, and armed with a most formidable power to conquer, and subdue, and draw into itself, the souls of those around it.

When an apostle found himself in a new place, it was not, as a lecturer before a lyceum, to utter his word to an inquisitive audience, and then pass on. But when, by addresses, in public or private, he had made two or three converts, they were formed into a church, with the privileges and functions which belong to a church of Christ. In every community thus visited, there was a living organization, making new converts, moulding them to its leading ideas — the little leaven which had begun with the few extending through the whole, and strengthening the heart of each member by the sympathy and enthusiasm of all.

Here is the primitive church of Christ. Endless corruptions growing out of false ideas which men had engrafted upon the gospel fixed themselves upon it. Still the church is a simple institution, growing out of the religion and the life of Christ, rather than what is called a positive institution built up according to any specific directions from him. The church of Christ is, in the simplest form, an embodiment of

the religion which it would receive, extend and perpetuate. It is at once the most receptive and the most aggressive of all organizations. It would receive and enfold within itself the highest life and truth which Jesus came into the world to impart. Now, as in the days of John and of Paul, it would gather souls beneath its fostering influence. It would be, in every community, a Christian association, with its offices of prayer, conversion, instruction and charity. It would educate the young. It would awaken the impenitent. It would reclaim the lost. It would lift up the fallen. It would seek out the lonely and forsaken. It would cheer the desponding. It would watch by the sick. It would hold up to the dying the token and the assurance of an immortal life, while it would bind together the living and the dead as members of the same great brotherhood, children of the same Father, disciples of a common Lord.

Here is the idea of a Christian church, in the primitive simplicity and power with which it went forth in the name of Christ to evangelize the world. And can we afford to do without it? Are we so rich in spiritual resources, that we can safely dispense with its services? Is the world so entirely in harmony with the spirit and the life of Jesus, that this divinely appointed agency is no longer needed to intensify and extend its influence through every community? We rebel against religious forms and institutions. But there is, at least there ought to be, no contrast between the spirit and the form—between the finer essence of our religion and its ordinances. On the contrary, its finer essence and spirit are preserved and perpetuated mainly by means of its institutions. Where devout and loving hearts come together to pray to a common Father, and find their devotions quickened by sympathy with one another, there is the purest expression that can be given to the finest sentiments of our religion. They who have prayed together will be all the better prepared to pray also alone in secret. Where devout and trusting hearts meet to commemorate the Saviour's death, and with love to one another and charity to all men seek in spirit and in truth to commune with him and through him with God, the

dearest bond of union between them and Christ is kept up. His life flows anew into souls thus reverently and lovingly turned towards him. Because he lives they live also. The life of man on earth is renewed by the life that flows into it from heaven.

The form is but an earthly medium through which the higher and purer influence is imparted. But take away the form, destroy the church and its ordinances, give up the endearing and sacred associations connected with them, and how many generations will pass by before the religion of Jesus will cease to be the grand conservative and progressive power in society, and will be known only as a remarkable system of religious morals? It lives in the church and through the church as a vital organization, animated by its spirit, enfolding within its holy sympathies and affections the souls of young children, instilling into them its divine hopes and longings, feeding them with the bread of life, offering them a shelter from the cares and doubts of the world, strengthening their faith through the divine life which it would quicken and sustain within them, giving them something of the peace of God on earth, and training them for the joys and blessed companionships of heaven. Here is the office of the Christian church with its holy and divinely appointed ordinances. Here is what it ought to be. And shall we not strive to make it such? As we value the love of Christ and pray for the advancement of his kingdom on earth, shall we not do more than we have yet done to make it a living power for the moral and spiritual renovation of society? Ye who stand aloof from its observances, who do not feel that they are necessary for you, and who are disposed to look down on them as adapted to the wants of a piety not athletic enough to sustain itself, consider how much of the power and essence of the religion which feeds and sustains you has been perpetuated and is now brought into your hearts indirectly through the instrumentality of the very institutions and ordinances which you regard so slightly?

As a matter of fact, how is it? Have the church and its ordinances been most honored and cherished by those whose

religious characters have been the least robust? We ask our readers to think of the most saintly men and women whom they have known — those who have done the most to make life beautiful and holy, who have been the purest emblems of God's love on earth, whose souls have been lifted up by the divinest affections and their lives consecrated to the highest ends — those whose strong natures have been most thoroughly subdued and purified and transformed into the image of Christ. Let them think of those whose thought and example have done most to commend the religion of Jesus, whose piety has filled the atmosphere in which they lived with its sweetness, and whose name and memory draw men's hearts upward with longings for God and immortality. Have they not usually been found among those who loved the church and sought through its simple but dearly cherished forms and ordinances for the life which comes down from heaven to renew and elevate, to refine and purify the life that is in us?

We should endeavor, in all ways, to cherish the religion of Jesus, to make it a vital power in our hearts and consciences and lives, and commend it to the souls of those around us. We should cherish it as a spirit and life, in our solitary meditations, by the aid of books, as an intellectual study, in all our intercourse with men seeking to live in accordance with its precepts. But in addition to all these we should cherish and sustain it by the institutions and ordinances which bring it home to the mind from week to week, which enforce it on the attention as the one thing needful here and hereafter, which wind it around the soul by all the sacred associations connected with the Sabbath and the church, the early home, a mother's prayers and tears when she offers up her little ones to God in baptism, the first intense longings of the soul after holiness, leading to the consecration of heart and life to God and to Christ in his church, by the dear memorials of his love, seasons of blessed communion with him, bringing heaven nearer and encircling us by the heart-refreshing presence of unseen and immortal souls, once our guides and our companions here, now holy ministers to us of a purer life from a purer world.

WINTER LAYS.

BY B. HATHAWAY.

O ROSE, whose tiny buds unfold
The promise of the perfect flower ;
O tulip, that a precious dower
Of beauty in thy heart dost hold ;
O lily, that a robe of gold
Art weaving for thy bridal-hour ;

Ye hyacinths, whose petals show
More than the blue of summer skies ;
Ye pansies, that so fair arise
And smile on April's sleet and snow ;
Ye violets, that, bashful, show
The heaven that is in loving eyes ;

And all ye waiting blooms that sleep
The sleep by rarest dreams beguiled ;
Ye children of the wood and wild,
That watch, but do not watch and weep ;
Oh for the simple trust ye keep,—
Your saintly faith, O undefiled !

Though fierce the stormy tempests rage,
Ye only hear the murmuring
Of summer, like the dreams that bring
The vision of love's golden age ;
And thrill to rapture's dim presage —
The pulse and prophecy of spring.

Oh ! for your patient " All is well : "
Though shrouded deep in gloom and night,
Of radiant hours of dear delight
Your dimly-folded petals tell,
As wing, dark brooding in the shell,
Foreshows a free, aerial flight.

O heart of mine! and art thou less
Than flower the kindly soil inurns?
The faithful sun to it returns —
Thy proper good thou shalt not miss;
More than a paradise of bliss
Lives in the soul that loves and years.

INSPIRATION.

BY F. T. WASHBURN.

IN considering the question of the Bible, we have before us, first, the Bible itself; and second the various views which men have held of the Bible, beginning with regard to the Old Testament among the Israelites before the time of Christ, and continuing from that early date among the Israelites and Christians to this day. These are two things related, yet distinct; on the one hand, the Bible itself; on the other, men's beliefs about the Bible. The history of dogma touching the Bible, of the various views held concerning it, includes a great variety of opinion. The Samaritans, for instance, held the Pentateuch to be the only sacred book, and rejected the rest of the Old Testament; the conservative Jews reject the New Testament; some Christians reject the Old Testament; many of the so-called Evangelical Christians and others reject the Apocrypha; the Protestant Church in general holds the original Hebrew and Greek to be the inspired book to which all translations must conform; the Roman Catholic Church declares its Latin translation also to be absolutely inspired; many persons think the whole book a mass of superstitions destined to pass away on the approach of enlightenment, or science, and culture, or their equivalents. These few examples suggest the diversity of opinion of which I have spoken.

They might be largely extended by a study of the history of dogma on the subject, including the opinions of unbelievers. Among this diversity of opinion, then, what standard have we by which to test it? What other standard than the Bible itself, the original object of all these various views, always open to our examination and proof? If any one wishes to know what the Bible is, let him search it, and see for himself. If he wishes to know the truth of any view advanced about it, let him test it by the Bible itself. To aid in his understanding it, the judgment of those better acquainted with it is of course of great help and value. A man's opinion is of value in proportion to his mind and to his knowledge of the subject, and his opinion should have weight accordingly — but the ultimate test of all opinions must be the Bible itself. If any one wants to have the Bible boiled down to one short and final article of faith, on learning which he need think no more upon the subject, he must seek the rest he craves in an infallible church. If he be a Protestant, he must accept the conditions of his freedom, and work out his peace of mind by searching for the truth until he find it, and in the truth he will find peace.

What do we mean by the inspiration of the Bible? First, let us take a look at books in general. We are a little apt to take an artificial view of books as of the other productions of the human spirit. To many of us a book is a book, a picture is a picture, and nothing more; something apart by itself. That is why so many people find no satisfaction in books, and look on a love of reading as a whim. What can you find in that old book? a friend will ask. Find in it? I find a man in it. And what do you find in the man? I find truth in him, nature, humanity, divinity, I find in him. When we recognize this in books, when we see that they are the counterpart of the human soul, and of all the truth with which the soul is related, the truth of nature, man, and God, then books acquire a new meaning to us. The book is the written word, the word is the speaking man, the man is the conscious inhabitant of the world, and the child of God. God speaks to the pure heart, and that heart speaks to

his brethren by word of mouth, and by the written word. Until we recognize this relation in which books stand with the human mind and with the truth, we can hardly be said to know what books are. When we recognize books as the instruments through which the whole human race speaks to us, imparting all its knowledge of the truth, the secrets of our human nature, the mysteries which it is conscious of, and the visions which are granted to it, then they take their places among the realities of our world, precious according to the contents of their message. What there is in them is what determines their value. Books reflect the human mind and the whole range of truth which it has been granted to the human mind to know or apprehend, and the scale of truth furnishes us with a scale for judging books. Thus I am related with material nature — the soil, the rocks, the animate creation, the inhabitants of the various elements. The teachers which interpret this outward nature to me bring to me nature herself, and their own scientific minds, and what of God there is in them. And to digress a moment, I imagine that half the interest now felt in physical science is really interest in the men who interpret it, with their courage, perseverance, and devoted faith in the truth. But, supposing we knew all the elements, and all the plants and animals in them, all very intimately, that could never bring us above a certain level. The full revelation of material nature could only lift us up to a certain height. There is a higher point, the human nature, which is the crown of our globe. The teachers and the books which interpret this higher world to us bring to us the treasures of the human heart, and of human life, and of what of God there is in them. This human nature and life branches out on every side. It ranges from the arts which minister to our physical needs up to the divinity of whose presence with us we are conscious. Our relation with material nature we have already considered. Above that, and on a higher plane of being, we are related with each other, with our fellow-men. The world of man rises above the material world, the world of man, human arts, sciences, commerce, institutions, governments, states, churches, society,

friendship, marriage, love, hate, misery, happiness, all the infinite variety of human life, and at the centre of it all, the one human heart. The teachers and the books which can interpret man and human things to me, which can reveal to me my own heart and the heart of my brethren, which can show me wherein lies the truth of human life, they are indeed precious to me. And above all, enfolding this little globe of ours, lies the infinite beyond ; back of our short human history lies the Eternal Cause from whence it sprung ; behind our human hearts with all their unfulfilled prophecies of life, lies our original. "Ourselves from God we cannot free," and he who will reveal God and divine things to us, who will interpret to us the mysteries whose fullness we cannot comprehend but whose meaning it most concerns us to know, he who will guide and uphold us in these our supreme, divine relations, is our most precious teacher, be his message spoken or written, be it from near or far : so only that it reaches us, it matters not.

What is it that makes the inspiration of all these teachers ? May we not say that it is the truth in them ? What is it that inspires our teachers of things physical ? It is the truth of material nature which they have reached. And what may we say constitutes their inspiration ? It is the material nature in them. If they have that truth in them, they can inspire others with it. And the same of the truth of human nature. Only he who knows what is in man can impart human truth to us. The truth of human nature constitutes this inspiration of the humane teacher. If he have that, then is his thought living thought, and acting from its own essential living truth. And the same with divine truth. And the truth of God in a man is divine inspiration. The truth of God become the thought of man, the truth of God in human thought, that is divine inspiration, having a life of its own, moving and acting by its own essential energy, taking form in word, in book, in action, in institution, or otherwise. The truth of God, the spirit of God, in man, in any human thing, in any production of man, is divine inspiration.

And how do we recognize this inspiration ? how but by the

spirit in us? If there be no answering spirit in us, we cannot recognize another's inspiration. Though an angel spoke the truth of heaven to us, if there were no spirit of truth in us, we could not receive it. He might come in such a blaze of glory as to overpower our senses and our minds, and convince us that he was a higher being than we; but if there were no spirit of truth in us, we could not recognize the inspiration of his message, though we might fully believe him a heavenly messenger. His message to us would be a mystery of which we could not apprehend the meaning. Only so far as there were a spirit of truth in us, answering to the truth he brought, could we catch glimpses of his meaning. And so the inspiration of a teacher of divine things can only be recognized by the spirit of truth, the spirit of God, in us. Without that spiritual discernment, it were impossible for us to recognize any divine truth. Does this then make us equal to our teachers and helpers? By no means. To recognize the truth of a thing, when it is shown you, is not the same as discovering that truth. There are millions of men capable of recognizing the truth of the steam-engine. Most of us, I suppose, if we had a patient man to explain it, and patience ourselves to study it, could in a short time recognize the truth of a steam-engine, how its power is got, how organized and guided, and what its effects; but who of us could have invented it? As we rise in the scale, up to the mysteries of the human heart and of human life, and to those divine mysteries which enfold us all, the truth becomes more spiritual, more difficult to bind to any earthly or temporal form, calls for the inward sense to apprehend it: the things of the spirit must be spiritually discerned, the recognition of divine inspiration can only be by the divine spirit dwelling in us.

If, then, we apply this to our sacred books, which represent to us the divine side of human nature, the human soul and human history, we may say that their inspiration consists in the truth of God which is in them, and the evidence of their inspiration lies in the witness of our spirits, the spirit of truth in our human hearts. It is plain that this evidence grows strong by accumulation. The private judgment of one

man is something ; the judgment of a thousand, if they be as good as he, is a thousand times as strong a witness ; the general judgment of mankind, of different generations and different lands, is the strongest possible human witness, apart from that witness which comes from the direct vision of the truth itself. A single soul which penetrates more deeply than any other into the divine truth will indeed by that very fact outweigh this general judgment of mankind. Let him get nearer to the heart of things, nearer to God and his truth, and he is thereby the teacher of all the world beside, not subordinate to them but their superior. His own voice, because of the truth there is in it, outweighs the voice of the whole world. But that direct vision apart, the general judgment of mankind is the strongest possible human evidence, and this general judgment means, in any special case, the judgment of those specially interested in and acquainted with the matter. The judgment of those who know and care nothing about the matter is of course good for nothing ; the judgment of those who have given their minds and hearts to it is the weighty judgment.

In judging the inspiration of books, and other human things, then, we have the spirit in us answering to the inspiration in them, and to help us the same spirit in our fellow-men.

Perhaps we have been considering this too abstractly for some minds : let us take a few instances. We look at the starry sky, and the words of the English poet come to us,—
“ This brave o’er-hanging firmament, this majestic roof fretted with golden fire.” There is inspiration in that. How it fits the scene and our minds, and gives an added consciousness to our delight in the heavens’ glory. There is in it the inspiration of nature ; the mind rests in these words of the poet as in the starry heavens which they reflect. Their inspiration is the truth of nature in them. But when the same poet says,—

“ Look how the floor of heaven
Is thick inlaid with patines of pure gold,
There’s not the smallest orb which thou beholds’t

But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims :
Such harmony is in immortal souls ;
But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close us in, we cannot hear it," —

here we have another inspiration. The truth of nature, the beauty of the starry host is there, but something more, the truth of human nature with its immortal hope inhabiting its mortality, and with its mystery of love. The glory of the heavens is made to serve this human truth, to open to us the destiny of the human soul ; the central motive here is human love. And this is a higher inspiration than the other. The mind does not rest here in the thought of the sky and the stars, but looks through them into the human heart. And when with the Hebrew poet we sing, "The heavens declare the glory of God ; and the firmament showeth his handiwork," — we have another inspiration. There is the truth of nature in it, in choosing these wondrous heavens as manifesting the divine glory, and there is something more. The mind does not rest in the contemplation of the heavens, it goes beyond to the original which they proclaim ; there is also the truth of God in it. Thus we may say of these three visions of the sky, the first has a natural inspiration, the second a human, and the third a divine inspiration. According to the nature of the truth which is in them are a man's words inspired.

Of our sacred books, the Bible is the chief, and the most precious collection. Beside that stand our other religious books, the lives of holy men, the words of holy teachers, the songs of sweet singers, the world over. The Episcopalians have a kind of supplement to their Bibles in their prayer-books, and the Roman Catholics in theirs, and in their other sacred books. The nearest approach which we have to a canon, or collection, of sacred writings outside of the Bible is in our hymn-books, but of these there is free choice and great variety among us, though the body of hymns in them has a considerable unity. The rest of our sacred books lie scattered, uncanonized by council or ecclesiastical assem-

bly, canonized only in the hearts of their readers, by the free affection of grateful minds; and it were well if our Bible were understood to rest upon the same deep foundation, for there it must rest, on the foundation of the human heart, the divine spirit in man answering to its call.

What, then, do we find in the Old Testament? We find a nation in it; and that nation the most divinely inspired of all antiquity. We find that nation's life in it, and we find in it besides the chosen men of that chosen nation. And what in the New? In it we find the chosen one of all the earth, with his associates and helpers, and first successors.

One word more. The Bible is a book, but it gives us not alone the thoughts of men, but their acts. Thus in the New Testament, the Evangelists give us not only the words of Jesus, but his action also, through which the truth of God which is in him is still more deeply manifested than in his words. The thought, the conception, the word, there may be truth in that, but the embodiment of that thought and that truth in action has a more convincing power, manifests a depth of reality in the thought which the mere uttering of it in speech does not so convincingly manifest. And in the New Testament we have both the word and the action of Jesus — the divine inspiration which was in him manifest in his speech and in the more powerful expression of his action. Thus while we do not have his thought as completely as if he had written it for us, we yet have his thought and action, his life, transmitted to us in a singularly blended and instructive way, each part helping the other, and both together helping us to a knowledge of his character, to an understanding of his spirit, and to a sympathy with him, and a faith in him. The spirit in us bears witness to his inspiration. His word and action meet a free response in millions of human hearts. Is that response an illusion? Then is the human heart and conscience an illusion. Nay, rather it is the spirit answering to the spirit — the spirit of truth in us answering to the truth of God in him. The general turning of men's hearts to him is nature's voice testifying to the truth in him who is the common object of their faith.

THE BROAD CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY ELIZABETH P. PEABODY.

THE decree of exclusion passed upon the Rev. Charles Voysey by the English bishops brought out from Rev. Stopford Brooke a series of seven sermons, preached at York Chapel, London, from the first of which we make some interesting extracts, giving the views of himself and others upon the liberty that may be legitimately enjoyed in the Church of England: that is, the liberty of thought and action possible to its ministers, and the breadth of faith and love some of them do actually preach and practice. It seems to me his definition of unity is exhaustive and indisputable; and that it holds out the promise of a truly united catholic church for Christendom, *maugre* all differences of intellectual conception respecting doctrinal points.

It is fitting that those who claim to represent, *par excellence*, the Liberal Church of America should exchange words of good fellowship with such noble representatives of the Broad Church of England as Stopford Brooke and others, who have evidently partaken of the illuminated spirit of the sainted Maurice, of whom the Unitarian Martineau said, in his memorial sermon, "He was the greatest spiritual influence upon England of the century."

"The conception of humanity, as one organic being, is made up of two ideas, diversity of parts, unity of nature. The unity of nature makes all the parts so related, each to each, that we are enabled to build them up into the conception of one being, whom we call the Man. The diversity of parts enables us to compose them into a living whole. They are not like a number of notes of the same pitch and tone, from striking which nothing comes but a monotonous roar, but are like a number of diverse notes capable of being composed into a finished symphony, every chord and note of which supports, prepares for, is in communion with, enhances, and develops every other note and chord. All are so mutually dependent, that not one note could be lost without unloosing the bond which ties them all; and all lead to the single grand impression,

which causes us to say, in spite of,—nay, because of the infinite variety—that it is one conception, a perfect whole.

“It is thus we arrive at the conception of humanity as one man. Each member is linked to each, necessary to each, assisted by and assisting each; giving and receiving, dying and living in turn, modifying and suffering modification by contrast, by opposition, by concord; and all in the past and present form the one ideal man, whom we call humanity.

“In different countries and times different modes of human nature were worked out, different ideas necessary to complete the great idea of the race. The Hindoo, the Egyptian, the Jew, elaborated their sides of humanity, and left to the future one or two principal conceptions. The Greek worked out the idea of harmony in poetry, philosophy, and art. The Roman elaborated the idea of law, and the correlative of law, duty; the ancient German the idea of freedom and its correlative, individuality. Add to these general ideas a crowd of particular ones, partly political, as when a society was the expression either of the democratic principle, as in Greece, or the municipal principle, as at Rome; partly moral, as the assertion of the greatness of temperance at Sparta, or the assertion of the heroism of the struggle against fate, as in the Greek drama; partly ideas belonging to feeling and imagination, as the sacredness of nature and the emotion of the beautiful; and then combine all these in thought into the being of one man, leaving aside those modifications of them which the experience of history has shown to be alien to human nature; and considering, not how they exist as they stand apart, but how they exist in union with, and how they act and react on one another; then behold beneath them all the one human heart and intellect and passions, as the fountain whose waters flow through the whole great river, and you will approach the conception of the unity of the race. Of all these ideas, we could not bear to lose one. There is not one of these representations of human thought which has not done its part in the growth of the main idea. We want every conceivable phase of human nature to be embodied in the history of the race; and the more numerous and complex are these embodiments, the nearer we are getting to the conception of the united whole, of the complete man. We get nearer to it when we look at modern Europe. Almost every form of social organization, every variety of political system, every kind of Christian creed, every phase of intellectual activity, every type of human feeling, every form of literature seem to coexist in Europe,

and to coexist in a thousand modifications, and in ceaseless conflict; the antagonism bringing out, day by day, the noble and human ideas, and rejecting the base and unhuman ones, and in the whole progress the idea of the perfect man of humanity becoming richer and more developed, in proportion as its parts become more various and its complexity greater. Instead of mourning over what seems to us confusion, or regretting the simplicity of Asiatic organizations, we should rejoice in knowing that the more every possible phase of human thought, feeling, and life is represented, the higher is the inner unity of Europe, and the less chance is there of that decay which follows on any one particular form of government, or any particular direction of thought, becoming dominant. If all the countries of Europe were governed by England, in accordance with the English system, the result would be stagnation. Europe would become like China. If the French character or the German or the Italian were to disappear from Europe, the loss to the progress of the race would be incalculable. We need them all and more, in order to conceive and complete our ideal man, in order to move forward to the realization of humanity.

"But, you may say, certain characteristic national types, such as the Roman, certain great ideas, such as that of the feudal system, have disappeared. True; but only when they had left that which was good in the type and the idea so deeply impressed on humanity that it became an integral part under other forms of every future type, and lived in the whole being of the race. The form under which it had grown up vanished, for its work was done, but the idea remained.

"Now, preserving in our minds this conception of the unity of the race, we can go on to represent the unity of a nation. Take England, for example. We must conceive of the nation as one being, growing into perfection by the slow formation and accretion of great ideas. The unity of this organism will have within it an infinite variety of parts, each representing some idea of feeling or mode of life, and all bound together by a common spirit,—love of the idea represented in the being whom we call England. The more diversified the ideas and the systems of thought, the more manifold the forms of feeling, the more varied the literary, artistic, political, and religious life, and the more these are all in a state of active action and reaction one on another, the richer and the more developed will be the national unity. The real danger to the progress of the nation will be when there arises the possibility of any one system,

or class idea, or mode of feeling, becoming dominant, and, like Aaron's rod, swallowing all the rest. Simplicity will produce monotony, and monotony stagnation.

"It follows from this that the nation will be tending to the true unity of a living organism only when every man in it has power to develop himself freely within certain limits chosen by general consent, and has power to do so in every possible variety of situation. Of course, these individuals, freely developing themselves, will group themselves into bodies, agreeing together in main principles, but reserving freedom of action and thought on points of opinion. Some of these opinions will be wise, others absurd, others absolutely deleterious ; but as we saw in the case of the history of the whole race that the ideas which were evil were eliminated by time and rejected, so in the case of the nation it is absolutely necessary that the absurd and harmful ideas should be expressed, in order that they may be seen to be what they are, and that time and conflict may destroy them. Hidden, repressed, they exist as an inward disease. Freely expressed, they are seen and burnt away.

"The Church of England claims to be a National Church, and consists, in idea, of all the laity of the nation without exception, and of a body of men who represent, within certain necessary limits, the religious thought of the laity.

"It does not, however, in fact, consist of all the laity. There are many who refuse to belong to its communion, on account of ecclesiastical differences ; there are others who deny the whole of its religion. But by right of birth every Englishman is a member of the National Church. It is of his own free choice that he rejects his right.

"Within its actual boundaries, however, it ought, on the principles already laid down, to permit every phase of religious thought possible to Englishmen, within certain limits, which demand belief in a few cardinal doctrines.

"In the assent of all to these doctrines, and in the common love of all to God in Christ, and the common love of the body to which they belong co-existing with an almost endless variety of individual views about these doctrines, consists the unity of the Church of England. The more various the shades of religious thought, the more complex the varieties of religious feeling, the more these act and react on, oppose, and unite with one another, the greater and richer will be the unity. The loss of one religious idea is the loss of so

much material for growth ; and any tendency to bind its members down to any detailed scheme of opinions in the matter of doctrine is the introduction of an element of decay, the subversion of a living unity by a dead uniformity, the replacing of a church by a sect.

"We prefer a church, existing, like Europe, in a state of political life ; torn, if you choose to say so, with theological disputes, with hundreds of ideas in conflict ; but still, like Europe, full of life, of belief in the future, of intellectual movement and spiritual fervor, preserving in its midst an inner unity, and working that out by means of the differences which seem to deny it.

"In such a church new ideas will meet with fair play : new forms of opinion, new methods of explaining the fixed doctrines, new forms of ritual, will be freely investigated and tried. Free discussions will eliminate what is evil in them and retain what is good. If they are doctrinally possible in any sense, the church will gladly embody them, that, by a greater variety of thoughts and of operation, its unity may be more richly developed. It may be that the forms under which certain true ideas have been represented will pass away, but they will only do so when the ideas themselves have been absorbed into the being of the church. Nothing necessary or noble will really be lost.

"I believe that the national parliament and the body of national clergy ought to be analogous on most points. The spiritual parliament ought to represent every religious tendency in the nation which is not diametrically in violation of the charter of the church ; and that charter ought to be kept as open and elastic as possible. The church ought to demand agreement in certain fundamental doctrines, but not to define the way in which those doctrines must be held ; to tolerate every form of opinion on those doctrines which does not absolutely contradict them in a sense to be determined by the law ; nay, more, not only to tolerate but to desire such expression if it represent any phase of English religious thought ; to listen to it, though it seem to nine-tenths of the members of the church absurd and heretical ; to encourage debate on every new view, and to remember that the only unmixed evil is arbitrary restriction of opinion. For if the clergy of the National Church do not represent all the religious ideas of its children, within the most extensive limits consistent with its existence, it is no longer national. Its representation requires remodeling.

"This is the true idea of the Church of England, an idea which

very few seem to understand. This is the idea on which the liberal clergy base their position in the church, and which they strive to push forward and support. Many attempts have been made of late years to narrow this conception and to overthrow it, but, thanks to our union with the State, they have failed."

THE ETHICS OF CRITICISM.

BY REV. H. P. CUTTING.

CRITICISM is an analysis of art and literature, to find out their relative and absolute worth for use, beauty, and human culture in its richest diversity.

"Fine art," says Ruskin, "has but three functions: the enforcing of the religious sentiments of men, the perfecting their ethical state, and the doing them material service."

Literature includes whatever has an enduring hold of the human mind, develops its powers, cultivates and exalts its sense of beauty, truth, and goodness: like the "Iliad," the "Divina Comedia," "Paradise Lost and Regained," and the tragedies of Shakespeare. These form the main current of literature, which is to be distinguished from the minor currents that belong to a particular age, and are characterized for their provisional meaning and influence.

The purpose of criticism is to find the real worth of the writings of men in the different departments of knowledge, and interpret these writings in the spirit of love and wisdom. The distinguishing feature in criticism is its ethical character. The critic "must find out what the work was produced for, the idea out of which it sprang, the ideal towards which it aspires. Every true work of art has such a central idea, and criticism is imperfect till this idea has been reached and exhibited, and we have been made to see how perfectly the means have been used to reach this end."* This kind of criticism implies wide knowledge, profound reflection, and a

* Prof. C. C. Everett's *Science of Thought*, p. 229.

standard to which there may be an appeal. This standard may not be infallible authority. It is established by the cultivated and superior minds of all ages. This is assuming that the general verdict of these minds is wiser than any one mind, or any one age. Half knowledge is often more confident than wisdom. There is need of criticism to restrain the cold assertions and injurious influence of half knowledge. Such a criticism is the result of extensive reading of the books that live from age to age,—of a cultivated, healthy imagination and quick insight into the relations of morals, philosophy, and æsthetics. It discriminates between the relative and provisional, and the absolute worth of all kinds of literature and art. Matthew Arnold's definition is ethical and suggestive: "A disinterested endeavor to learn and propagate the best that is known and thought in the world, and thus establish a current of fresh ideas."* Criticism, as thus defined, is inspired with the love of justice, and with reverence for wisdom, beauty, and truth. Its business is not dissection of the form, till it reaches the life that pulsates through and animates a work of art or a literary product. Destructive criticism requires strength, will, and an intellect keen, vigorous, and smiting with such blows that it will destroy the form of what it strikes. It is a great gift—

"To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it as a giant."

It does not comprehend the relations of the old and new, the transient and the permanent, the beautiful and the true in literature and art. It is easy to find fault; but it is difficult to construct a poem, a speech, or a sermon that is an organized whole. Critics not able to do this on any high principle of art, make it a point to find inadequate statements, partial knowledge, and slight errors in those products that claim attention from their unity, simplicity, and beauty. Literature takes up into itself fresh knowledge, the thought of original, intuitive minds; and is more enduring than the language in which these thoughts are made known to mankind in the dif-

* *Essays in Criticism*, p. 36.

ferent stages of their discipline and growth. Genial criticism points to the reader one of the rarest things in literature and eloquence,—the union of energy and simplicity. Its business is to see things as they are. The ethics of criticism teach the duty of wise interpretation,—not dissection and death. This interpretation requires the open vision, fresh knowledge added to old knowledge, freedom of mind, serious endeavor to take in the meaning of the best thought in the world, and teach it with love and joy.

The bane of criticism comes from provincial habits of mind. A cultivated man is free from the defects of a local dialect. He puts his thoughts into his maternal speech according to its laws and genius. Criticism is provincial so long as the critic is not imbued with noble culture. Matthew Arnold says, in his essay on Heinrich Heine, "To ascertain the master-current in the literature of an epoch, and distinguish this from all minor currents, is one of the critic's highest functions; in discharging it he shows how far he possesses the most indispensable quality of his office,—justness of spirit." Justness of spirit is the characteristic of such critics as Goethe, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Sainte Beuve, and Matthew Arnold. Goethe had the sympathies of a scholar for literature and art, in ancient and modern times. He was a man of large reading. His knowledge was varied and critical. He was never satisfied with his attainments in science, art, poetry, and practical skill. He was continually adding fresh knowledge, and kept himself in the master-current of the best literature in the world. He had sympathy with noble ideas. More perhaps than any man of his time, he combined practical knowledge of life with literature and art, and was free from the defects of a provincial culture. This is the secret of his imperial sway over the thinking and literature of his age.

Coleridge had culture, knowledge, and genius that fitted him to be a critic and teacher of his age. He knew that a philosophy, which assumed that nature and spirit are one in substance and equal in power, made moral freedom and responsibility impossible. He denied the pantheistic philos-

ophy. He constructed a spiritual philosophy, founded on the distinction of nature and spirit, the reason and the understanding. In the "Aids to Reflection," these distinctions are brought out with clearness. His other prose writings contain a body of original, invigorating criticism, not surpassed by any other writer of his time in the English language. Coleridge, like Goethe, had read to learn the best thought in the world. This qualified him to be a profound and suggestive critic. He had genius and the capacity to take in the meaning of the most advanced thought. His wide knowledge provided him with the materials for a great poet. His mind was creative. Such minds in literature furnish the materials for discriminating criticism. Coleridge was a poet, superior to Pope and Young. Young turned his complaints into "Night Thoughts;" Pope, a man of genius, was more of a mechanic in poetry than an inspired maker thereof. Coleridge had the mind to see nature and life as they are, reproduced the impressions received from study and insight in poetic forms that will endure as long as the language he wrote. He lived in the fresh current of ideas, and these ideas were an organic part of his life. His lectures on Shakespeare are critical interpretations of the great poet. Some of the best criticisms on literature, art, and philosophy have been suggested by these lectures. They are not superseded, but a light and guide to the higher criticism in knowledge and wisdom.

Wordsworth was a poet. He devoted his life to this art. He did not read so much as Coleridge and Goethe. In consequence of his limited reading, he had a more provincial tone than these men. He put a low estimate on criticism. Speaking of the reviews, he says, "The writers in these publications, while they prosecute their inglorious employment, cannot be supposed to be in a state of mind very favorable for being affected by the finer influence of a thing so pure as genuine poetry." He formed his estimate of the worth of criticism from the sharp and shallow critics of his day, and form the false literary judgments of "The Edinburgh Review." Some of the critics in this review treated Wordsworth's "Ode to Immortality"—one of the grandest crea-

tions of poetic genius — with the scorn and the contempt consistent with intellectual barbarians. Wordsworth did not think enough of criticism, for two reasons: first, he was familiar with bad criticism; second, he spent most of his time in meditation and composition. Creation is a higher function than criticism; and yet criticism may be as creative in the noblest sense. Not in the sense in which Shakespeare and Michael Angelo created, but in the sense that it discovers the beauty in works of art and literature, and interprets it to minds less creative. Such criticism as we find in "Grote's Plato," in John Stuart Mill's "Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy," is worth more than superficial treatment at first hand.

Two modern critics, Sainte-Beuve and Matthew Arnold, illustrate the ethics of criticism. If they have not reduced criticism to a science in the sense in which logic and rhetoric are sciences, they have made it an art worthy of the cultivated minds in France and England.

Matthew Arnold has an original style. He may be sometimes over-nice; but he is catholic in taste, comprehensive and solid in his knowledge. His literary taste was formed by the study of Homer. He knows the productive periods of English literature, and the best literature of Germany and France. His essays in criticism are expressed in a style of simplicity, clearness, and force. He says that the purpose of criticism is the endeavor to find the select thoughts of the master minds, and propagate them in the spirit of sympathy and love. He has studied in the spirit of a scholar to get nearer perfection in style and thought. "The formation of a sound literary taste is one of the most difficult achievements." This taste Matthew Arnold has, not in such perfection as Goethe; but in this respect he is the equal of Coleridge, and superior to DeQuincey. If ever a man was a born critic, sharp, clear, and vigorous, that man was Sainte-Beuve, born in 1804, died in Paris, November, 1869. He began by writing fiction and poetry. He was inferior to Byron, Keats, and Shelley in poetic genius. In his poetic period, Cowper, Pope, and Wordsworth interested him. He could not translate the spirit, dignity, and

sweetness of Cowper and Wordsworth into the French language, and charm the ear and heart of the French people like their own native poets. At the age of forty, Sainte-Beuve gave himself wholly to criticism. He left at the time of his death thirty-nine volumes wholly devoted to criticism. He lived in the fresh current of modern thought,—his mind open to truth and beauty. His portraits of celebrated woman are specimens of accurate criticism, illuminated with love and cultivated taste. He never separated moral principles from his most searching criticism.

The ethical critic has an intuitive sense of the meaning and unity of literature. It is addressed to man,—not to one class, but to all men in all times ; such are the works of Homer and Shakespeare, Milton and Dante. The wise critic does not attempt to reduce diversity of style and methods to one mechanical pattern. If it could be done, it would be death to freshness and originality. Criticism is not a system of mechanics, but an organic growth. It is a developing process. The perfect critic is the perfect artist. Matter and form are important to him, like body and soul, a complete organism. He knows that it is better to comprehend the spirit of literature and art than any formal imitation of it. Noble culture comes from assimilation, not imitation. "A principle of life is the first requirement of all art, and it can only be communicated by the touch of time and simple faith in it." The true critic will not praise an author for his style in a few passages. The question which he asks is, Is the whole product a unity? If unity is lacking in a poem, oration, sermon, brilliant passages will not redeem it from the fault of not putting things in their right relations. This insight does not come from imitation, but from long, patient culture of heart, imagination, and reason. The critic feels the joy and sorrow of his age. Goethe, in his early manhood, made a revelation of his sorrow and despair in the "Sorrows of Werther," and "William Meister." The secret of the immense popularity of these books is, that he expressed the sorrow and doubt of his age. Men and women learned that this gifted writer suffered as they suffered, and revealed it with the skill

of an artist. Human hearts are drawn to the man who tells them their mental anguish and interprets it with the genius of a poet. This was the transition period of Goethe's culture. He attained an intellectual repose that enabled him to carry out his purpose in life, which was, from first to last, self-culture. Byron, without the culture and imperial self-control of Goethe, sang out of the depth of his agony; and this is one reason why he is still the poet of thousands who are in mental and moral despair. The problem of despair is not solved by self-culture alone; but by humility and reverence, love and self-sacrifice.

Human life is never exhausted. Its realities never pass into dotage. Wonders and mysteries will open to the last child on this planet. In all time, poetry and art, philosophy and religion, will burst into new forms of beauty and power as on the day when the first human pair set sail on the unknown sea:

"The world all before them, where to choose
Their place of rest, and Providence their guide."

Some of the fundamental principles of ethical criticism may be stated in few words.

There must be a large body of literature before there can be any science or ethics of criticism. There must be poetry before an art of poetry. There are good reasoners before there is a science of reasoning,—good rhetoricians before any science of rhetoric. Ethical criticism involves the meaning of literature. There are two kinds: the *transient* and the *permanent*. The transient pleases and instructs; the permanent moves and lives. DeQuincey, in his "Essay on Alexander Pope," makes this distinction: there is the literature of knowledge and the literature of power. The literature of knowledge is provisional. A work on science may at any time be superseded by one containing the result of new discoveries. History and physical science belong to this department of knowledge. The literature that moves is addressed to humanity. It speaks to man's reason, heart, and imagination through all time. This literature, like nature, is addressed to man. It has an interest for the child and

the philosopher. Humboldt did not exhaust the meaning and poetry of nature in writing "Cosmos." Agassiz has a clear conception of undiscovered wonders, laws, and principles in the world of matter and force. Problems multiply with new discoveries.

The Green Mountains of Vermont are not less objects of wonder and delight because the White Mountains of New Hampshire are more rugged, and in some respects more grand. Both have beauties that will never be superseded. The valley of the Connecticut will remain in ages to come as beautiful as to day. The valley of the Mississippi, extending far back from the banks of the great river; the bluffs that rise in symmetry and grandeur; the sweet vales between the bluffs; the springs and brooks of pure, cold water gushing out from the side, or at the base of the bluffs; the trout that have beauty and the grace of motion; the cattle and sheep that graze in content,—present a scene of beauty that will never pass away while the earth remains: yet the valley of the Connecticut is not, and never can be, superseded; for "a thing of beauty is a joy forever."

Shakespeare is unlike Homer, Milton unlike both; yet they will be read as long as the language exists in which they wrote. Literature comprehends the writings of different ages and nations, and is distinguished as the literature of knowledge and the literature of power.

Criticism is worthless, if it does not keep in view this distinction. Without making this distinction, the critic is as likely to put the Koran and the Bible together as that they cannot be thus classified without an abuse of the laws of thought and language. Without this distinction, criticism may claim that Young's "Night Thoughts" and Pope's "Essay on Man" are literature in the sense in which Shakespeare's "Tempest," "Hamlet," "Macbeth" and "King Lear" are so. It is the business of criticism to distinguish the literature that is permanent from that which is transient.

Criticism ought to be catholic in spirit.

Goethe's "Faust" is different from "Paradise Lost" and Wordsworth's "Ode to Immortality." The critic would show

the want of a catholic mind who should deny that "Faust" is literature, because not like Milton's "Comus." The remedy for any such provincial treatment is comprehensive and exact knowledge, a cultivated taste, formed from long and sympathetic study of the best products in art and literature. If we cannot study some of the best specimens in the original, it may be done in translations. It is a good discipline to read Plato in the original; but, for the general student, Jowett's translation will give ample justice to Plato's thoughts, if not to all the niceties and subtle distinctions in the original. The study of a good translation need not be superficial. Let every man who has the time read his authors in the original; but where this is not possible, take courage in what Emerson says, "I like to be beholden to our great metropolitan English speech, the sea that receives the tributaries from every region under heaven."

Criticism ought to be philosophical in its method.

It takes into consideration the time, the culture, and the intellectual and moral atmosphere in which an author lived. A critic of Shelley would not do justice to his genius, if he quoted a few passages from "Queen Mab," and then assumed that this is the true and complete revelation of the mind of Shelley in its greater maturity. Philosophical criticism connects itself with biography and history. Before passing final judgment on Shelley as a poet, his life ought to be studied as a whole, and the facts and influences with which he was surrounded. Thus only can we gather the material for an adequate criticism of his poetry. The same wide discriminating study is necessary to appreciate Byron, Burns, Keats, and Cowper. In this way the critic will determine what in their writings is transient, and what is permanent, and tell which grain will grow and which will not.

Philosophical criticism is just in statement, comprehensive in knowledge, and noble in thought. There is a striking contrast between this kind of criticism and that which aims to find an author's faults. Sharp criticism, if not under the control of the philosophical spirit, will be unjust. If an author states nothing new on the subject to which he invites

attention, if his reasoning is confused, if he makes bold assumptions instead of stating facts, the critic will show this, and warn the reader not to waste his time on such an author.

✓ Ethical criticism aims at adequate interpretation.

A work ought to be judged by its own merits. The question where the author lived, what his culture and character were, may be interesting; but they are not to be taken into account in deciding on the value of a work of art, a poem, oration, or sermon. If there is any doubt about the origin of these products, some knowledge of the authors may be important. But on the supposition that a painting, statue, poem, and oration are completed, and presented for criticism, the criticism has no concern about the author, only with the product. The critic's business is to interpret the work, "not to travel out of the record (to use a legal phrase) and consider the character of the writer, while analysing the merits or defects of his productions." When a book is criticised to find its excellences as well as faults, the question is not who wrote the book, but what are its merits and defects? The critic who assumes that he must know an author before he can intelligently criticise his productions, might be seriously perplexed in his interpretations of the Homeric poems, the book of Job, several other books in the Old Testament, and a few in the New. The critic has nothing to do with the character of an author, if his business is criticism and that alone. If he claims to be a biographical critic, then his business is not with literary creations. Ethical criticism assumes that the character of an author or an artist is not to be judged in connection with his work. An example will test the principle. The political writings of Thomas Paine are full of clear statements and positive arguments in favor of American independence and a republican form of government. Are his views on this subject true? The critic cannot logically draw the inference that his political doctrines are unsound, because his character may be. Writings have come down from the past of great worth, and many works of art. Of the character of their authors we know nothing; yet they have been the subject of criticism by able men. Criticism that judges of products in literature and art by the character of their authors leads to

confusion and injustice. If character is to enter into our judgment of intellectual and æsthetic products, what is to be done when we know nothing of the author? Critics do not know where Homer was born, whether he wrote a word of the "Iliad;" yet that poem is the subject of the finest criticism in the German, French and English languages. It is enjoyed by thousands who know nothing of the man, Homer. If we knew more of Shakespeare, we should not understand his "Macbeth" or "Hamlet" any better. Would any one admire more the Transfiguration by knowing the artist? Who would appreciate the Apollo Belvidere less or more by knowing the sculptor? Who knows the men who built the Parthenon and the Coliseum?

The method of comparison is used by men like Arnold, Bunsen, and Niebuhr, and rises to the dignity of historical criticism. Has a book any light, has it been superseded? This question is answered by the method of comparison. This method is one of restraint. If any poet has been overdone, it is Shakespeare. Not every sentence he wrote is profound. He knew when small talk was fitting,—his superficial critics do not.

That large body of critical discussion from Chaucer to Tennyson is of immense value. A critic who interprets Plato, Kant, Locke, and Sir William Hamilton, so that they may be read with new interest and sympathy, is indeed a teacher of his age.

The heart makes the critic as well as the theologian. Our own literature will help to do this. It is the product of some of the foremost minds of the world. English literature is a fountain of wisdom. It develops life in all who come to its study with humility, and the free play of disciplined powers of mind and heart. The reason, the understanding, the fancy and the imagination, the conscience and the will, are invigorated with its strong common sense, the genius of humanity. It develops and inspires a love of freedom in obedience to law.

"We must be free
Who speak the speech which Shakespeare spoke,
The faith and morals hold which Milton held;
We are sprung of earth's best blood,
Have titles manifold."

PERSONAL IDENTITY.

BY M. W.

WHEN we think of the changes that must come over us in even the least eventful life, it seems surprising that we always retain the sense of our own identity. Compare the child in his earliest intelligent consciousness of his own existence with the same child grown to mature years or to old age, and how little is there to mark him out as the same being! The soul, if it have attained anything like its just proportions, has expanded far more than the body. The universe has spread out immeasurably around him. His domestic and social world is equally changed. He is transformed perhaps from the child into the parent. A multitude of sweet friendships have been his, with those whose early years were spent in regions far distant from his own birthplace. If his life has been extended to old age, he has been handed down, as it were, from generation to generation; and as the bright links, that formed the beauty of his early days, have fallen away, others have constantly been added to the chain that still binds him pleasantly to the present life.

This is the common experience; and yet as we look backward through the long train of memories, multiplying with every added year, and are sensible of the changes, external and internal, that have transformed us almost into different beings, still underlying all is the abiding consciousness that, though other, we are still the same,—the same notwithstanding the change in tastes, opinions, habits of thought, and perhaps motives for action.

There are seasons, indeed, when from some startling change of circumstances we seem to walk as in a dream, and ask ourselves the question, "Can this be I?" But the soul's response is still, "*It is I myself.*" So, too, in reviewing certain passages in our experience, we may look with astonishment on our own conduct, and feel almost that some power outside of ourselves led us to act as we did. Yet the voice within assures us that we cannot eliminate the deed or word from its place. It must stand forever as a fact in our life-history.

With all the errors, all the sins, we may have to deplore, I think there are few of us who would not wish to retain this same conscious being through all eternity ; purified, enlarged, exalted beyond our present conception, but still " I myself." The idea that all souls will at length become absorbed into Deity may be sublime, but it is not human. How shall we surrender all the fond memories of this our early life,—the blessed affections that have glorified and hallowed earth,—the myriad experiences that have made us what we are ? Would the man or woman willingly resign the remembrance of the first home, the still unbroken circle, where father and mother, sister and brother threw a radiance over life, that has never since lost its glory ? No : through the eternal ages we would look back on the life begun in so much weakness here, but gathering into itself strength and beauty with its larger experience, and its ever multiplying ties of love reaching on forever and ever.

THE TEST OF LOVE.

FROM THE GERMAN OF CHAMISSO.

WHETHER I love thee ? How that question ask ?
Or how could any words that doubt remove ?
My life alone to thee my love can prove,
And words are all unequal to the task.

Whether my love will last ? I pity her
To whom an oath could such assurance give.
Oaths are but oaths, mere words, like leaves they live
While summer's breath may vital power confer.

"How canst thou, naughty man, thus try my heart ?
What could I mean, but that I wished to hear
Thy lips declare my joy, thou cross, sweet love !"
Thou holiest, purest, from the choirs above,
Yet mine ! my pet, my wife, my strength, my cheer,
My being's all, my love, my life, thou art !

T. H.

HOMELESS CHILDREN.*

UNDER the title of "Little Hodge," the author of "Ginx's Baby" has published his third satire. It bears upon the problem of a surplus population in the agricultural districts of England. A puny infant, left motherless at its birth, the eleventh child of a farm-laborer, whose full wages were but nine shillings a week, is the hero of the story. The father tried for a time to support his children on his scanty wages, but, finally driven to despair, he left them, knowing that the deserted children would get in the work-house the food and clothing which they could not have while he was there. He was arrested and brought back as a vagabond, tried, and imprisoned, and on the expiration of his short sentence, his family were taken from the work-house and returned to him. In the meanwhile a union of farm-laborers had been formed, and a strike for higher wages made; during harvest season good pay was the result and the funds of the union relieved those strikers who were most needy. But with the winter hardships returned with greater force than before; the land-owners, angry at the independence of the striking laborers, withheld the customary Christmas charities, and finally Hodge, driven by starvation to despair, secured, by his own voluntary death, that pauper support for his children which the law of England denied to them while he was alive.

The book is written in much the same style which has characterized the author's previous satires; it is however less keenly satirical and less racily written than either of the others; it is less of a satire and more of a story; it is less extravagant and more practical. Some of the scenes are drawn with considerable power, and many a reader will be moved to tears, when the squire and neighbors, bearing the dead body of the self-murdered Hodge, find his poor children on Christmas morning, half starved and half frozen in their

* Little Hodge. By the author of Ginx's Baby. New York: Dodd & Mead.

wretched cottage. And the author is not contented to show in absurd baldness the glaring evils of an existing system, but he shows also a remedy, and a remedy which he credits to "Yankee intervention." The strike itself is not without its good effects; the union teaches the poor laborers to think and act for themselves, and transforms the agricultural serf into a man; it is conducted with moderation, and the terms finally agreed to by the farmers are such as to allow the laborers a comfortable support, and yet with improved methods of cultivation and diminished poor rates to prove no burden to the proprietors. But the remedy specially directed to the main object of the book is of a different order. It is the forming of an association, whose duty it is to take care of children, who are either orphans or whose parents cannot support them, and to carry away these children from the overpopulated parts of England and distribute them among families and homes in the thinly settled colonies. The story is extended to show the working of these remedies, and ten years after the Christmas morning when the father was found dead and the children almost frozen, Little Hodge himself forms one of a party of children who are taken out to Canada, where the poor child of the miserable farm-laborer grows up in a happy home.

The Twentieth Annual Report of the New York Children's Aid Society, just issued, is the record of a noble work in the crowded American metropolis; of a charity which aims at aiding and helping to honest lives the multitude of poor children whose parents, if they have any, cannot or do not care for them. This society furnishes rooms where the newsboy and boot-black or the homeless girl can lodge comfortably for a trifling price; it sustains industrial schools, both day and evening, at which more than seventy teachers are employed, and with an average daily attendance of nearly three thousand scholars; and it finds places and employment for the children, having during the last year alone scattered children through twenty different states. During the twenty years which this society has been working, it has provided in the Newsboys' Lodging Home alone, one of the five lodging

homes which it sustains, beds for more than one hundred thousand different boys, most of whom would otherwise have spent the nights in the streets, yards, or docks, or if sheltered in a house, would have been surrounded by influences worse than any exposure to cold and storm ; and it has found homes for nearly thirty thousand individuals, many of whom have grown up to be useful members of society.

This society and its work is the best answer to such books as "Ginx's Baby." Fortunately such cases as that of Little Hodge are rare among us ; the country and farming population of America are well to do, and the instances of country laborers overburdened with large families and oppressed by extreme poverty are very few. But the American Ginx exists : he is to be found in the large cities. There poverty, crime and disease dwell together in crowded tenements and dismal cellars ; there children whose parents are living are often worse than orphans, and there many a boy escapes from home in early years and knows nothing of his father or mother. It is a significant fact that of the three thousand children for whom the Children's Aid Society found homes in 1872, more than one-third had both parents living, while nothing was known of the parents of thirteen per cent of the whole number. The emigration association of "Little Hodge" was intended to perform in the English country a part of the labors which the Children's Aid Society performs in New York City, and the picture which the writer draws of its success, with the letter from Little Hodge in Canada, is a counterpart of the Appendix of the Twentieth Annual Report. Objections may be made by some to the introduction of such children into good homes and respectable life ; they are the offspring of low and vicious people, and the character of the parents may be inherited by the child. To some extent this may be true, but the inheritance of qualities of character is uncertain in its workings, and is less the inheritance of vice than of particular bents of mind ; the best answer to such an objection are the facts, that so large a number of children who from example alone must otherwise have grown up to be thieves and drunkards, are now living as useful and respectable men, in

the places where this society put them. If this work can be and has been done among the poor of a great and wicked city, much easier, safer and surer would be a life-work among the children whom Little Hodge represents, whose inheritance has been one of poverty and not of sin, and whose early lives have been pinched by cold and starvation but not blighted by the contagious examples of vice.

FAITH NO ELEMENT IN THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY AUSTIN BIERBOWER.

I purpose in this paper not to give any arguments for or against Christianity, but only to show on what principles we should judge of its evidences.

I may say, by way of preliminaries, that there is no ground for claiming, that we are any the less free in our thinking, or that we give less scope to our reason, in believing the alleged facts of religion than in believing any other facts, provided we have equal evidence for them. The religionist, or most decided believer in Christianity, can, therefore, be as complete a free-thinker or rationalist as the unbeliever. On the contrary, if there is full evidence of the truths of Christianity, we are as much bound to believe them, if we would act reasonably, as we are to believe any other facts, as the achievements of Cæsar or of Bismarck; and any person who does not believe them with such evidence shows either that he has not grasped the subject in its totality, or that, being prejudiced, he has made a criminal misuse of reason.

I may say, farther, that it is no more an indication of weakness of character, or of an unscientific turn of mind, to believe or act upon even the most orthodox teachings of religion than to believe anything in natural science, as the circulation of the blood, or the de-oxydizing of plants, provided we have equal evidence for them. I may go still farther, and claim that it is even the duty and province of science to take up

the truths of religion, if we should have reasonable evidence of their being truths, and give them their place and force in history, in cosmogony, in intellectual science, and wherever they have a bearing. Men like Agassiz and Lyell ought to take up in geology the Mosaic account of the creation, the standing still of the sun on Gibeon, the darkening of the world at the crucifixion, and explain them in harmony with the totality of the other facts of science. Men like Darwin and Wallace and Huxley ought to take up the creation of Adam and Eve and the descent of all the race from Noah. Men like J. S. Mill and Trendelenburg in their mental philosophies ought to take up such questions as the influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind, as also of baptism, of confirmation, of ordination, and of temptation by the Devil. For if these are facts they have their place in science, and must not be overlooked in any exhaustive investigation of the subjects to which they pertain.

This is all on the supposition, however, of there being full evidence of the truth of Christianity — evidence full enough for us to believe it with certainty. On what principle, then, shall we judge of this evidence? or on what principle shall we determine of the truth of Christianity? The most obvious answer is that we should judge of it and determine its truth as we do that of everything else. If there is like evidence for its truth as for the truth of other things that we believe, we should believe it; if not, we should reject it. This answer will stand as self-evident, unless there is some ground why we should believe Christianity on less evidence than we believe other things. This, however, is inconceivable. For if there be any reason why we should believe it on less evidence, that itself must be an evidence for it. In other words that reason must furnish us some evidence why we should believe it without evidence; that is, it would be one kind of evidence enabling us to dispense with another kind. We can safely say, then, that we should have, in order to believe Christianity, the same evidence, taken as a whole, as for believing anything else — in other words, that we should accept it only on evidence.

And yet the position will be combated by Christians generally, who insist on our having faith that Christianity is true ; that is, on our believing it, whether we know anything about it or not.

It is this doctrine, namely, of faith in the evidences of Christianity, that we shall here combat. For, aside from its falsity, which we shall presently consider, it endangers rather than aids the cause of Christianity with any one who approaches the evidences of it: for there is the presumption that any one who sets up this claim has himself no confidence in the truth of Christianity, and so does not want it examined ; and that, if the church as a whole does this, the church as a whole is convinced of the untenableness of Christianity, and so wants it accepted without inquiry.

We may go even farther, and say that, if it is actually necessary to admit this principle in order to sustain Christianity, namely, that we should receive Christianity on faith, we must admit, and there is no longer any reason to deny it, that there is actually not sufficient evidence for it. For, if there is sufficient evidence, what reason have we for assigning any other ground than the evidence for believing it? We should believe it because it is proved true, or at least rendered probable by the evidence.

Farther, if we accept Christianity on faith, we cannot answer those persons who maintain that we do not act in reason in accepting it, or that we are unreasonable in our belief of it. Any one who claims that Christianity is reasonable dares not maintain that we have need of accepting it without sufficient evidences.

We do not say that the evidences may not be widely scattered, and be of various kinds and degrees of strength ; that they may not be in all ages, and found in all departments of science and literature and history, and even in the mind *a priori* ; and that they may not be circumstantial as well as direct, and corroborative and cumulative as well as principal. But we say that, taken as a whole, they must, if we can claim to be reasonable in accepting religion, be sufficient in themselves, so that we do not need to add faith on their side to turn the scale in their favor.

We do not say even that as a whole they may not also give only partial certainty ; that is, that they may not lead only to a degree of probability instead of to certainty, and yet we be reasonable in believing religion. But in that event, if we claim to be reasonable, we must accept Christianity as only probable, or as probably true, and not have a degree of certainty beyond the evidences. Should this be the state of the case we ought not to condemn those who doubt, but should admit that they, that is, the skeptics, are the only reasonable persons ; and we should rather discountenance all strong faith or certainty in religion.

Farther, we do not say that there are not cases where Christianity may be reasonably accepted without evidence, whether it be true or not ; or that, in order for us to be reasonable it is necessary that we withhold its teachings from children or learners, because they cannot judge of the evidences. We may teach it to them dogmatically, and as absolutely true, just as we teach the truths of geology or political economy to them ; for they will necessarily take it as certain, whether we wish them to or not, since we cannot always communicate to them the degrees of evidence with the facts. They must receive it therefore, as they receive everything at first, namely, on authority. They must take it by faith, as we say, because they do not, and cannot, know of themselves ; and they rightly do this, because they have confidence in us, that is, because they think that *we* know, and that we teach them what we know. But in teaching them Christianity we ought not at the same time to teach them *faith*, or the duty of always thus believing it without evidence ; but rather we should teach them to examine it themselves when they get an opportunity, and encourage them to substantiate it from the same sources that we do. A child is taught geology, but is not taught at the same time that he must be on his guard lest somebody should hereafter persuade him that it is not true as now taught, or that he should never allow himself to accept any other theories on the subject than those which he is now taught. He is taught rather what is known now of the subject, and encouraged to go on

and inquire further, so as to learn more things himself, as well as to correct his present knowledge. In religion only has it been the custom to teach people the facts, and then to teach them to shut their eyes against ever getting any other view than what they are taught. Persons should be taught religion and taught the evidences of it, but not taught the belief that it is a duty to believe it.

We do not deny that we may all sometimes with reason give ourselves over to authority, and believe what is told us. We do this when we accept the statements of historians, like Macaulay, or reports of investigating committees, or statements of scientific experts. But we must in such cases have evidence that the authority knows. If any body or book or organization pretends to tell us about God or immortality, we ought to know whether such party is competent to speak. If, for example, our Bible is from God, we may acknowledge that it can tell us about God; if the church is instructed by God in the matter of religion, we may acknowledge that it can teach us in religion. But we must have evidence that the Bible *is* from God, that the church *is* instructed in these matters. If we have evidence of all these things and then believe them, that is not believing on faith, but on evidence. To believe on faith would be to believe the Bible and the church when there is no evidence of their truth, or else not sufficient evidence; that is, when we do not know whether they are competent to speak on the subject, or not. Nobody would be willing to say that he believes the Bible without having any reason for it. And yet this is what persons do when they claim that we should accept it on faith.

Again, we do not deny that we may rationally believe Christianity because of the general belief which is accorded it, just as we may rationally believe the stories of Napoleon or the accounts of gold in California; for many of us have no personal evidences that Napoleon did the things alleged of him—many of us do not know even whether there is anybody that saw him do them, or whether the more critical historians acknowledge that he did them, or which of them he did. We say we have no evidence of many of these

things, and yet believe them. But though we believe them because of the general belief, we have evidence that the general belief is correct, especially when there is no disagreement among men, and when we see there has been every opportunity for men to know. Our experience furnishes sufficient grounds for such confidence in men. But that is not accepting the things on faith, but on evidence; and if we accept religion for the same reason it is accepting it on evidence, and not on faith. Anybody that enforces religion on this ground, namely, that the great or the learned believe it, need not exhort to faith, but may plainly set forth that the things are doubtless established by evidence. We may not personally have the original testimony at hand, and therefore must accept it on the word of others; but that does not imply that ultimately mankind must depend on faith for it.

With these principles defined, we shall proceed to show that we should judge of the evidences of Christianity as of everything else, subjecting them to the same criticism, and accepting or rejecting Christianity according to the weight of evidence; in other words that we should allow of no favoritism on one side under the name of faith.

If we admit the principle of faith, we can prove anything true. We have only to say that although there is no evidence for it, yet by faith we know it to be so. We can accordingly believe the story of Romulus and Remus, the miracles of the saints, and the adventures of Baron Munchausen. We can believe that the moon is inhabited, that its mountains are of ice, or that the sun is drawn by Apollo's horses. For what is to determine whether we shall believe one thing rather than another, if not evidence? We have only to think of anything, to be able to say that we know it by faith. Any reformer or heresiarch can start up and say, "I will teach the immortality of beasts, the spirituality of plants, or the insincerity of Christ. I have only, in the absence of evidence, to urge the people to believe it on faith." It may be said, perhaps, that we do not believe such things, and have no inclination to; so that there is not the same ground for holding to them by faith as there is for holding to the truths of Chris-

tianity, which we actually do believe. Grant that this is true about some of these things, as the inhabitants of the moon, or the nature of the sun ; yet there are many people who believe Mohammedanism on faith, and Mormonism on faith, they being the only subjects of faith that are presented to them. And we may ask why we may not just as well say that the Turks know Mohammedanism to be true, not because they have any evidence for it, but because they exercise faith? And in an argument with a Mohammedan or Mormon how can we reason against his accepting his religion on faith, when we do the same? In short, if we lay down this principle to be followed, it will open the door to all sorts of follies ; and the more foolish men will have the greater advantage. It is the principle itself that is wrong ; and on a bad principle we cannot make any distinctions in favor of Christianity, as against Mohammedanism or any other system of paganism. We are apt, of course, to call our procedure *faith*, and theirs *superstition*, but that does not help the matter ; for all the rest can return the compliment, and with equal reason. If Christianity be true, and the other systems not, we have no means of knowing it, if we must judge by faith. Faith can be as strong in other systems as in ours. In fact, we find more faith the farther we go into the depths and grossness of superstition, the amount of faith being the measure of ignorance rather than of knowledge.

In the next place, we have no evidence whatever of faith being any surety for truth ; for when did the world ever learn that if it believes a thing it will be true, or that the truth will always be believed instead of error? Our experience, on the other hand, is that of all the errors the most and the greatest come from believing without sufficient evidence.

It may be said, perhaps, that we do not know anything with certainty, or full evidence, but must ultimately accept everything on faith. Yet, if this so, and in as far as it is so, it applies only to the metaphysical or ultimate data, as, for example, to our pure intuitions or to the primary deliverances of our senses, and not to historical facts or matters of common sense apprehension. Because I must accept the exist-

ence of matter or of motion on faith, that is, without being able to prove it satisfactorily, or understand it ultimately, that does not imply that I must accept a story about ghosts or witches, or any historical fact, on faith. The truths of religion are historical and not metaphysical; and like all other matters in the phenomenal world, they ought to have such evidence as is required for other phenomena. Whether they may not be otherwise in some transcendental sense than they appear to our common sense reasoning, is like the question whether the earth, notwithstanding it seems to us extended, may not nevertheless be not extended, and so two acres of land be equal to one. All our knowledge may be false, in an absolute sense; and yet, so long as it hangs logically together, it is true, at least, in a phenomenal sense. Whether, now, religion is true in this phenomenal sense, we must determine by subjecting its evidence to the same logical scrutiny as other phenomena. But if it is found false in this sense — the only sense in which we know anything at all — there is not much probability that it is true in a sense in which we cannot examine it so as to know.

Again, we have no special faculty of faith, that we should put such exceptional confidence in it as is sometimes claimed; that is, we have not, that we are aware of, any power to get the truth by merely making a decision in the matter, or believing, without knowing or without having sufficiently studied the subject. It would be a very strange faculty, and contradictory to all our intellectual experience, that could, by merely making a subjective decision, tell us whether the accounts of the Bible are true, or whether the Christ who appeared eighteen hundred years ago was God.

So much for the principle of judging of Christian evidence in general. The subject, moreover, has something peculiar to itself, which has a special bearing in the consideration of its evidence. It would naturally be expected, from the readiness that men have to believe it without evidence, that it must be something very probable in itself, and something of a kind that requires very little evidence. If this be so, we can pardon those who ask less proof of it than of other things.

When we examine it, however, it appears quite different. What we are asked to believe is nothing less than a lot of supernatural events, which scarcely any evidence could prove ; as the appearance of God and demons upon the earth, the raising of the dead, &c. We should need, not only extraordinary evidence to prove such things, but the best circumstances for the original observation of the facts and for the transmission of the evidence ; for we have no experience of such things having occurred at any other time. This is not a subject, therefore, on which we should be content to accept anything on little evidence, such things, indeed, being the very last that we should believe on any evidence.

The fact that it is very desirable to believe what religion teaches, that is, that it is something good, should not make it any the more credible. Our experience is not to the effect that good things are all true, or more likely to be true than others.

The fact that we have, *a priori*, as many persons believe, impressions of the existence of God, of the immortality of the soul, &c., all of which are doubtful, to say the least, should not make us accept Christianity any the sooner. Even if it be true that there is a God, or that he designs us for immortality, it does not follow that the Bible is true, or that the many things that it tells us on these subjects, have come from God. It is not certain that, if there be a God, he would give us a revelation at all, and again not certain that, if he did, it would be such as the one we claim to have. We say, therefore, that the general convictions of humanity in regard to God, immortality, duty, etc., should not make us less exacting in regard to the evidences of Christianity.

In fact, if we are to believe in religion we must have, not only full proof, but proof that will surmount the improbabilities with which it is antecedently hedged, — proof not only sufficient to establish ordinary historical facts, but sufficient to establish miracles. As great proofs, then, as, on a fair consideration, should be thought necessary to prove miracles, should be had before accepting Christianity ; so that we can come to the world and say, "There is nothing unreasonable in Christianity, for, improbable as the things are that it teaches, the proofs are sufficient to establish them true."

HOPE.

FROM THE GERMAN OF EMANUEL GEIBEL.

THOUGH haughty winter, threatening so,
Still darkly on us lowers,
And casts about his ice and snow,
The spring shall yet be ours.

And though the mists throng thick and fast,
The sun, their barriers breaking,
Shall show his face of light at last,
The world to joy awaking.

Then blow, ye storm winds, blow with might !
I will not fear your power ;
For spring, light-footed, through the night,
Brings on the happy hour.

Then earth awakes, in verdure new,
In wonder without measure,
Smiles upward to the sunny blue,
And almost swoons for pleasure.

She decks herself with garlands gay,
Grain-ears and roses glowing,
And gives the brooks their rippling way,
Like joyful tears fast-flowing.

Then peace, O heart ; 'mid frost and cold,
Contentment still possessing !
The world a May-day shall behold
More bounteous yet in blessing.

And when hell seems on earth to reign,
And fear thy hope o'erpowers,
Let trust in God thy strength sustain !
The spring shall yet be ours.

S. C. R.

THE TRUE CHURCH.

LESSONS OF LIBERALITY.

WE have read with great interest an article on "Swedenborg and the New Church" in "The New Church Magazine," for February. We have been especially struck by the catholic tone and sentiment of the writer, P. W. Chandler, and gladly transfer a considerable part of the article to our pages.

He begins with a short and comprehensive account of Swedenborg, and then speaks of the small number of those who are nominally connected with the church which popularly bears his name, and the small number of Christians in the earth compared with all its inhabitants. The remainder of the article we give entire, omitting a portion of the notes.

"As to the New Church, any attempt to measure its influence or to limit its extent by a reference to the number of those who are familiar with the writings of Swedenborg, and who receive his doctrines as true, would well illustrate the remark of an able writer, that figures of themselves, unaccompanied by any explanation of the nature of the subject upon which they bear, and especially without any account of the causes that may have influenced them or the circumstances by which they were attended, can lead only to false conclusions or to no conclusions at all. In a certain sense the New Church was never so firm, so strong, so numerous as it is today. A misapprehension in this respect is almost universal among Christians, and prevails too much among the readers of Swedenborg, owing in a measure to a misunderstanding or misapplication of terms. If we regard it as a sect, comprised of the few who read and approve his writings, the prospect is not encouraging. But if we regard it, as he himself regarded it, a church founded upon certain principles and embracing men in all sects, denominations and countries, Pagan as well as Christian, then we shall entertain very different views.

"What, then, did Swedenborg understand by the term 'New Church?' In the preface to his last great book he says: 'The faith of the New Heaven and the New Church in its universal form is, that the Lord from eternity, who is Jehovah, came into the world that he might subdue the hells, and glorify his humanity: that with-

out him no flesh could have been saved ; and that all will be saved who believe in him.' . . . 'The particulars of faith on man's part are: 1. That God is one, in whom there is a Divine Trinity, and that he is the Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ. 2. That a saving faith is to believe on him. 3. That evil actions ought not to be done, because they are of the devil, and from the devil. 4. That good actions ought to be done, because they are of God and from God. 5. And that man should do them as of himself ; nevertheless under this belief, that they are from the Lord operating with him and by him.' This in regard to Christians. As to those who are not Christians he says, 'The Lord has mercy towards the whole human race, and wishes to save all that are in the universe and to draw them to himself. The mercy of the Lord is infinite and does not suffer itself to be limited to those few that are in the Church, but extends itself to all throughout the whole world.' 'And besides,' he adds, 'those who are out of the Church and are called Gentiles live a much more moral life than those who are within the Church, and far more easily embrace the doctrine of a true faith when they are instructed in it hereafter.' 'The worst of all people come into the other life from the so-called Christian world bearing deadly hatred towards the neighbor and towards the Lord.' In another place he says: 'The Church is, specifically, where the Word is and where the Lord is known by it, but still those who are born where the Word is and where the Lord is known, are not members of the Church on that account, but they who live a life of charity and faith ; *for the Church of the Lord is with all in the universe who live in good according to their religious principles, and acknowledge a Divine Being, and all such are accepted of the Lord and go to Heaven.*'

"The New Church, therefore, is no more limited to those who have read and receive the writings of Swedenborg, than salvation is limited to those who have received the Bible. All who live a life of charity, who endeavor to keep the commandments of themselves, but in the confidence and belief that they are from the Lord, operating with him and by him are, or will be, of his New Church. There is a most important use to be performed by the receivers of Swedenborg's doctrines. They occupy a certain position, and it is an interesting and responsible one ; but they are no more favored or beloved by the Lord than those who never heard of our author. Others, uncounted multitudes, are also in the Divine economy, pre-forming uses in advancing His kingdom, some of which they under-

stand and some of which are hidden from their eyes. If we and others of like infirmities choose to magnify our offices, and to be filled with conceit and despise the position and works of others ; if we contend among ourselves about forms and ceremonies, and take much trouble about mint and cummin, and are puffed up with pride and self-righteousness, and so are small in numbers and feeble in influence, the New Church itself is marching forward under the great Captain ; who, in his divine love and wisdom, embraces all his children and provides for their salvation, so far as they, whose freedom he never impairs, will permit him to place them in mansions of eternal happiness.

"It is an extremely narrow view which regards in the descent of the New Church only those doings which affect our narrow circle. It is because we are blind and will not see ; it is because we are deaf and will not hear, that we lament the slow progress of the truth. Old beliefs are fading away ; old systems are so modified that they have lost their peculiarities. Who does not appreciate the wonderful changes in religious opinions within a hundred years while the forms remain the same ? Who now believes in the Athanasian creed without such explanations and qualifications as fritter away its obvious meaning, although it is still printed in the English Book of Common Prayer ? Who now receives the doctrine of 'decrees,' or the awful theories of man's relation to God as Jonathan Edwards taught them ? Who now of any denomination can read the old works on theology without a shudder or a smile ? While all these systems, built up and defended by some of the greatest intellects in the world, are crumbling away like the horrible rites of pagan nations, some people wring their hands and lament because their own particular church does not increase more in numbers and influence.

"Still, the fact that those who are familiar with the writings of our author are so few, is, in some respects, a singular one, and not a little trying to those who regard him as actually illuminated. A little reflection, however ought to convince them that this is not surprising, and indeed could not well be otherwise. While Swedenborg himself was toiling with an industry which had no cessation in writing and printing his voluminous works, the question never seemed to trouble him whether anybody read them. He was so absorbed in the themes of which he wrote, so completely wrapped up in the great mysteries he was unfolding, that an immediate reception of them by the world was the last thing he considered. Living

at a time when the masters of polite literature were on the stage, and when there was extraordinary religious excitement, he apparently took no interest in, if, indeed, he knew anything about them, and his works are more free from any remarks on passing events, or reference to living characters, than any in existence. There is no instance in which he alludes in any theological work to a living personage by name. There is nothing in them calculated to excite the least natural interest, still less any enthusiasm among the living. And even now when men and things are greatly changed, and there is much excitement on the very topics he wrote about, his works are so bare, positive, and emphatic; so utterly destitute of any attempt to soften the condemnation of falses; so absolutely outspoken in regard to everything which was contrary to his system; and so free from every thing that tends to excite the imagination or pervert the sentiments, that they are very apt to shock the ordinary reader and to excite his disgust by their dullness. It is quite significant also, that, all through his writings, things are presented like the *Memorable Relations*, apparently with a purpose (for they are sometimes out of proper connection), of compelling or of persuading the reader to throw them aside, unless he is really in such a state of reception that he clings the more earnestly and persists in going further. The intelligent readers of Swedenborg regard this as providential, in the belief that it is among the most injurious things for men to profane the truth, since it is far better for one to be ignorant of it than to know and deliberately reject it.

“Moreover, the purposes of Divine Providence are very different from what they are often supposed to be.

‘God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform.’

“If Christianity itself has not, in 1800 years, accomplished any thing like worldly success, since there are four times as many heathens as there are Christians, and especially if more heathens are saved than Christians in proportion to the number of each, a problem is presented far more difficult of solution than the one we are considering. One great difficulty arises from the supposition that the Lord does not love all his children alike, and that his designs are not calculated to save the whole human race, but only a select few, and especially that he can make men free, and at the same time compel them to be saved, whether they consent to be so or not. Our own position in his vast designs may be very humble.

How is it possible for any individual or any collection of men to understand the percise use they are performing in the great designs of Jehovah? How can we appreciate the methods of an Infinite Being? How can we know but that our efforts are of no avail, and even worse than useless? How can we assert that our own position as a church is not intended to be obscure, and our numbers small? The real Church, or Church Universal, on earth corresponds with the Grand Man in Heaven, and the Christian Church corresponds to the heart and lungs. It is sometimes said that the 'specific New Church' as to the 'general New Church' corresponds to the heart and lungs; but the heart and lungs, although most important organs and essential to life, are never seen of men, and multitudes are not aware that they even exist. It is for us to walk in the path where we are placed and to do the immediate work before us in humility of spirit in the assurance that every step we take may count in the grand march and assist in the final result.

"These considerations are not gratifying to the natural man. Although ready enough to confess with the lips that of and in ourselves we are nothing, it is somtimes only the stern discipline of sorrow and the sharp agony of experience that cause us to bow our heads and confess in the bitterness of disappointed expectations and hopes that, at the best, we are unprofitable servants. It is well for us, when our own selfish schemes for increasing the Lord's kingdom are defeated, and all our attempts to do good so far come to naught, that we are willing to obey His will implicitly and occupy just that position as a Church and as individuals where he can employ us best. In the words of the author of the 'Growth of the Mind,' 'Let a man's ambition to be great disappear in a willingness to be what he is; then he may fill a high place without pride and a low one without humiliation.'

"When men are really in earnest, and entirely willing to devote themselves to usefulness, *the way to do it* opens of the Divine Providence. But when men are not in earnest, they love to expend their forces on details and methods and plans of their own, and interpose their own schemes. When thus obstructing all progress, they grieve that, while the harvest is small, men are starving for food. The highest love we can show the neighbor is to aid in introducing him into the Lord's New Church, not necessarily our particular church, in order to swell our numbers or increase our importance; but to assist him in keeping the commandments by a true acknowledgment of the Lord. To do this more effectually, we must enlarge our vis-

ion, restrain our selfishness, acknowledge all who live a life of true charity as brothers and co-workers. We know and feel that the writings of Swedenborg, while unsparing in the denunciation of falsities and evils, are full of the gentlest charity for all. They throw floods of light over the whole field of duty of man to man. They greatly enable us to bear with cheerfulness the ills we have. They point out the way of life, and lead us to him who loves all mankind, whether good or bad, whether in this world or in the next ; Him who is the true object of worship, not merely in temples made with human hands, not in this mountain or in that valley, nor by any particular forms and ceremonies, but in the hearts of the children who love his law and try to keep his precepts. 'Our fathers worshiped in this mountain,' was the plaint of the woman of Samaria, 'and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. . . . God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.'"

We add as a fitting pendant to these wise and liberal views a few words from a discourse (printed, but not published), by Rev. Dr. Furness, on the forty-eighth anniversary of his ministry. The discourse is a very charming one, made up mostly, as its title indicates, of personal recollections, especially his recollections of Dr. Channing. We take the liberty to copy a few paragraphs.

"There is no doctrine, no creed, however logically and scripturally impregnable, that is so important as the *simple lesson of human respect*. He who learns that, has the root and substance of the whole matter. It is good to be respected and to be worthy of respect, but the best thing is to cherish respect, and especially to regard with good-will those who differ from us the most. This is the especial office of Christianity ; it is the thing for which Jesus lived and died, — to bring man to recognize his brother man, notwithstanding all differences. And when different denominations are living together in mutual respect, then the best purpose of Christianity is fulfilled.

"This is essentially such a fundamental article of faith with me,

the sum and substance of uncorrupt Christianity, that I have never been inclined to preach what are called doctrinal sermons. 'Have you been here so long?' it has been said to me sometimes, and by not unfriendly voices, 'and have you only one Unitarian church here?' My friends, if the progress and diffusion of that spirit which is Christianity, are to be measured by the number of churches bearing the Unitarian name, the fact that we have only one Unitarian church here is humbling indeed. But what if the churches of orthodox names are all growing in the Christian grace of liberal feeling? What if, as a clerical friend of mine, not of our denomination, remarked to me the other day, — what if the tone of Unitarian thought is pervading all denominations? which is only saying that the same causes which have produced Unitarianism are operative in all churches, rendering them all, more or less, more liberal; in fine, what if the spirit, which alone I care to be zealous for, is working everywhere like leaven, and just as Jesus said it must work, why should we be anxious to build Unitarian churches? Why, all these churches are steadily becoming ours, — ours in fact, whatever they may be in name. Have a little patience: and there will, by and by, be, in spirit, no difference, but only in names and forms.

"I have been, through all these years, most especially interested in attempting, for myself and for you, to obtain a clear, positive idea of him whose name we bear, whose memory we cherish, and who is the creative centre of all our modern life. I have no stronger faith than this, that it is not in any formal doctrine, but in the character, in the personal life, in the spirit of Jesus, that the enlightening and saving power of Christianity consists. As we are brought into intimate and active sympathy with that, we are cleansed, strengthened, comforted, delivered from evil affections, raised above temptations, above fear, above death. So believing, I have spoken. But whether I have helped you, I hardly dare to think; for if I have, I do not believe I could be safely trusted with that knowledge. I should be sure to spoil all by self-conceit, forgetting that it has never been I, but the power of truth, the grace of God.

"But pardon me that I have kept you so long. The lapse of eight and forty years admonishes me that the day is far spent, the shadows are lengthening, the night is stealing on. But there falls no shadow that can cool the fervor of my good wishes for you all. May Heaven's best blessings rest on you and yours forevermore."

Similar to these, if in a higher and more dignified form of expression, are words which we find in Dr. Channing's new volume.

"Christ has one church, not many churches. All Christians are comprehended in one community. However scattered, separated, and divided,—in their fellowship with One Head, in their participation of one faith and spirit, they are attracted by a combining principle, which, though counteracted now, can never be destroyed; and which will ultimately manifest itself in blending all believers, visibly and indissolubly, into One. . . . Now if all Christians constitute one communion only, then it is implied, not merely that Christians of the different denominations, which are scattered throughout the world, are nearly connected with one another here below, but that Christians on earth and Christians in heaven are livingly bound in fellowship. . . . If revelation be worthy of any credit, the intercourse between heaven and earth is most close and constant. Jesus Christ, risen and glorified,—who once lived here below,—now lives on high, not as an unconcerned spectator, but as a mighty agent for the good of the whole human race. Angels, commissioned by his boundless love, he sends forth to minister to all heirs of salvation. Near him are Christians, who, departed from this world in faith, now sympathize and co-work with him in promoting the growth of his ever-expanding community.

"How unparalleled in dignity is the Church Universal, as we have now contemplated it! In extent it surpasses all other communities, gathering in its wide embrace spirits made perfect around the throne of God, holy men in heaven, and the children of the Father throughout all nations. And as to duration, not only has it withstood the shocks of ages,—outlasting Empires and States amidst which it has been planted, and still flourishing with perennial growth while they decay,—but it is appointed to survive the present order of the natural world, and to be transformed from glory to glory in regions of the universe beyond all adverse change. How cheering is this confidence that we are even now citizens of a kingdom that can never be moved, members of a community that is organized by a principle of imperishable life!

"When, by an act of faith and hope, we transport ourselves into the world, where human nature is redeemed from every sin and woe, and there behold the good, the just, the wise, the lovely, trained in all regions and ages,—a multitude which no man can number,—

exalted to new life, new powers, new friendships, new prospects of the immense creation, and new ministries of love in co-operation with higher beings and with God,—then does the awful grandeur of immortality open before us ; then do we feel, with devout gratitude, that this birth-place and school for spirits is worthy of its Divine Author, and of its sublime consummation.

“ ‘Compassed about by this great cloud of witnesses,’ let us with firm and cheerful trust endure all trials, discharge all duties, accept all sacrifices, fulfill the law of universal and impartial love, and adopt as our own that cause of truth, righteousness, humanity, liberty, and holiness,— which, being the cause of the All-Good, cannot but triumph over all powers of evil. Let us rise into blest assurance that everywhere and for ever we are enfolded, penetrated, guarded, guided, kept by the power of the Father and Friend, who can never forsake us ; and that all spirits who have begun to seek, know, love, and serve the All-Perfect One on earth, shall be re-united in a celestial home, and be welcomed together into the freedom of the universe, and the perpetual light of his presence ! ”

THEORIZERS.

FROM THE GERMAN OF CHAMISSO.

THEY vex me much, these many trials how
 To make the earth turn back from east to west ;
 'Twould grieve me less, did foolish men think best
 To help her turn from west to east, as now.

Fool, to be vexed ! As in the book of fate
 The word is written, shall the ages flow ;
 The earth shall stedfast in her courses go.
 Thy wrath is vain, it falls on thine own pate.

I know full well my judgment they despise,
 I cannot change them ; let their folly run !
 Be still, my heart,— thine anger is not wise.

Yet when I hear them, great in their own eyes,
 Each other praise,— “ How bravely we get on ! ”
 Then, hang them all, my anger still will rise !

T. H.

PROF. DE MORGAN.*

A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE. BY WILLIAM MOUNTFORD.

PROF. DE MORGAN was the son of a British officer, and was born at Madura, a little island near the coast of Java. He died about two years since after a life of intense activity mentally, and without having quite filled out threescore years and ten, as to bodily endurance. He was a student at Trinity College, Cambridge, in England; but he was debarred of the degree he might have taken, and of other advantages that might have been his, by his unwillingness to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.

Mr. De Morgan has been long known, and well known, to all the world, — the world as far as it knows anything to the best purpose, — for a man of great distinction as to logic and mathematics, and also as to the literature connected with those subjects. He was for many years, and till recently, a professor in University College, London. He was a good, as well as an able man, and religious also; though for some reasons of his own, he was unable to connect himself with any Christian church or denomination. His description of himself was, "a Christian unattached." Probably, he had had too much experience of churches, to be willing to connect himself with any particular denomination of Christians, and thereby risk his mental independence, and that priesthood of his own before God, which early in life, had cost him dearly, in assertion, as against outrageous authority. He married the daughter of William Frend, and of his father-in-law, he writes, —

"There is a mistake about him, which can never be destroyed. It is constantly said that at his celebrated trial, in 1792, for sedition and opposition to the Liturgy, he was *expelled* the University. He was *banished*. People cannot see the difference: but it made all the difference to Mr. Frend. He held his fellowship and its

* A Budget of Paradoxes. By Augustus De Morgan. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1872.

profits till his marriage, in 1808, and was a member of the University, and of its Senate, till his death, in 1841, as any Cambridge calendar, up to 1841, will show. That they would have expelled him, if they could, is perfectly true; and there is a funny story, also perfectly true, about their first proceedings being under a statute, which would have given the power, had it not been discovered during the proceeding, that the statute did not exist. It had come so near to existence, as to be entered into the Vice-Chancellor's book for his signature, which it wanted, as was not seen, till Mr. Frend exposed it: in fact, the statute had never actually passed."

Within the last three years, reviews have appeared in this magazine of memoirs in connection with Crabb Robinson and Edwin Wilkins Field. Augustus De Morgan makes up, with the other two, a triad as to friendship and public purpose. His sympathies religiously were Unitarian, and he expressed aloud and vigorously his disgust, as to the non-election of Mr. Martineau, to be Professor of Moral Philosophy in University College, London; the ground of objection to Mr. Martineau, having been, not that he was a Unitarian, but that he was a Unitarian of distinction.

Oh, but the dear close brotherhood, there was in England, among the earlier combatants for civil and religious liberty! And, no doubt, the sense of it was a great and peculiar comfort, while suffering, as they did, for their struggles against "the abomination of wickedness in high places." Not only as to the diamonds that may enrich a festival display, but also as to the saving salt of the earth, great purifying must have been endured; and many a man to-day in England is freer in soul because of Augustus De Morgan and his friends, and the predecessors whom they so greatly loved.

A man with whom yea is yea, and for whom nay is nay simply and truly,—being also a thinking man,—was exposed to great trouble in England, when Prof. De Morgan was born; and still, no doubt, in some situations, and occasionally, in England, at least, both as to the church and the world, a man may be at a disadvantage, because of his honesty. But however that may be, the name of Augustus De Morgan is still worth marking for distinction, as that of an

honest man. Still it is to be hoped as connected with the church or anything religious, that a name for scruple or honesty, will very soon be nothing very remarkable.

• As might well have been expected from Prof. De Morgan, making such a start in life as he did, the art of playing fast and loose as to theological phraseology and profession, was what he could not endure.

Pre-eminent as the Professor was as to mathematics and logic, he was more eminent still, as a man who never tried to make figures lie, and who, also, had power enough to make the worse appear the better side, without ever attempting to do it, on any arena.

It might well be inferred, from Prof. De Morgan's self-respect, as to signing the Thirty-nine Articles, and thereby qualifying himself for emoluments at college, that he would in after life, as the world goes, fail of reaping all the honors, that rightfully should have accrued for him. He was consulted on behalf of the Royal Society, but he never belonged to it as a Fellow. He says that he never offered himself as a candidate for a Fellowship. As to whatever it was, for which he was not a Fellow of the Society, he says, —

“Nothing worse will ever happen to me than the smiles, which individuals bestow on a man who does not *groove*. Wisdom, like religion, belongs to majorities; who can wonder that it should be so thought, when it is so clearly pictured in the New Testament from one end to the other?”

Mr. De Morgan was for some years a contributor to “The London Athenæum.” Learned nonsense and bad logic, were things, for which as a critic, he had a fine instinct. His handling of the scalpel was very accurate; but it often needed for a proper appreciation, an eye as keen almost as his own. This volume is a reprint of his articles. It is a book, by which, for a man to test his wits. Of such passages as might become our pages, we will give a few.

And here is an observation by a good observer: —

“New knowledge, when to any purpose, must come by contemplation of old knowledge, in every matter which concerns thought;

mechanical contrivance, sometimes, not very often, escapes this rule. All the men, who are now called discoverers in every matter ruled by thought, have been men versed in the minds of their predecessors, and learned in what had been before them. There is not one exception. I do not say that every man has made direct acquaintance with the whole of his mental ancestry: many have, as I may say, only known their grandfathers by the report of their fathers. But even on this point it is remarkable how many of the greatest names in all departments of knowledge have been real antiquaries in their several subjects."

For charlatans, Prof. De Morgan must have been an uncomfortable man to consort with. And with theologians he was capable of making terrible work.

"The doctrine-forged of the Roman Church is one glorious compound of everything that could make Heroclitus sob and Democritus snigger. But not the only one. The Protestants in tearing away from the Church of Rome, took with them a fair quantity of the result of the Roman forge, which they could not bring themselves to give up. But they would have no premises except from the New Testament: though some eked out with a few General Councils. The consequence is that they have been obliged to find such a logic as would bring the conclusion they require out of the canonical books. And a queer logic it is; nothing but the Roman forge can be compared with the Protestant loom. . . . The public at large trying to be conversant with the ways of *wriggling out*, as shown in the interpretation of the damnatory part of the Athanasian Creed, the phrases of the Burial Service, &c. The time will come when the same public will begin to see the ways of *wriggling in*. But one thing at a time: neither Papal Rome nor Protestant Rome was built — nor will be pulled down — in a day."

That is true. In these times, however, though learning and logic may be slow, yet are they also sure instruments for the disintegration of what is not true.

"A year or two ago a bishop wrote a snubbing letter to a poor parson, who had complained that he was obliged in burial, to send the worst of sinners to everlasting happiness. The bishop sternly said, '*Hope* is not assurance.' Could the clergyman have dared to answer, he would have said, 'No, my Lord! but "sure and certain

hope" is as like assurance as a *manikin* man is like a dwarf.' Sad to say, a theologian must be illogical. I feel sure that if you took the clearest headed writer on logic that ever lived, and made a bishop of him, he would be shamed by his own books in a twelve-month."

When logic gets fun to support it, it becomes then very provoking perhaps, but also very keenly persuasive. These are the Professor's words about ritualism:—

"The common sense of our national character will not put up with a continuance of this grotesque folly: millinery in all its branches will at last be advertised only over the proper shops. I am told that the Ritualists give short and practical sermons; if so, they may do good in the end. The English Establishment has always contained those, who want an excitement: the New Testament, in its plain meaning, can do little for them. Since the Revolution, Jacobitism, Wesleyanism, Evangelicism, Puseyism, and Ritualism, have come on, in turn, and have furnished hot water for those who could not wash without it. If the Ritualists should succeed in substituting short and practical preaching for the high-spiced lectures of the Doctrinalist, they will be remembered with praise."

Still ritualism, he could not think of respectfully at all, or hopefully. He had known something of it, and pretty familiarly, as a student at Cambridge. That vestments, rich and varied and elaborate and skillfully used, may avail the church as well as the theatre,—that colors, black and white and violet and scarlet, may have influence as a display,—and that chasuble, beretta, hood, and cope may possibly be fascinating words,—he would readily have granted. But apparently he would have added, "Alas for the minds affected so, if indeed they really are much affected!" Here is the way in which he would illustrate such a subject as ritualism with its much ado about church-clothing:—

"When at school I heard a dialogue, between an usher and the man who cleaned the shoes, about Mr. ———, a minister, a very corporate body with due area of waistcoat. 'He is a man of great erudition,' said the first. 'Ah, yes, sir,' said Joe: 'any one can see that who looks at that silk waistcoat.'"

Prof. De Morgan was a man of wide and varied experience: and he writes what, apparently, is as true as the Bible itself.

"It may almost be taken for granted that theological system-fighters do not read the New Testament: they hunt it for detached texts; they listen to it in church in that state of quiescent nonentity, which is called reverent attention: but they never read it."

Mr. De Morgan has a notice of a theological work:—

"‘The Rock of Ages,’ by the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, now published by the Religious Tract Society, without date, answered by the Rev. Dr. Sadler, in a work (1859) entitled ‘Gloria Patri,’ in which says Mr. Bickersteth, ‘The author has not even attempted to grapple with my main propositions.’ I have read largely on the controversy, and I think I know what this means. . . . There is a point, which I should gravely recommend to writers on the orthodox side. The Unitarians in England have frequently contended that the method of proving the divinity of Jesus Christ, from the New Testament, would equally prove the divinity of Moses. I have not fallen in the way of any orthodox answers specially directed at the repeated tracts written by Unitarians in proof of their assertion. If there be any, they should be more known; if there be none, some should be written. Whichever side may be right, the treatment of this point, would be indeed coming to close quarters. Since writing the above, I have procured Dr. Sadler’s answer. I thought I knew what the challenger meant, when he said that the respondent had not grappled with his main propositions. I should say that he was clung on to from beginning to end. But perhaps Mr. Bickersteth has his own meaning of logical terms such as *proposition*. He certainly has his own meaning of *cumulative*."

Of the progress of civilization, here is an illustration:—

"The notion that the *non*-existence of God can be *proved* has died out under the light of discussion: had the only light shone from the pulpit and the prison, so great a step would never have been made. The question is now as above. The dictum that Christianity is ‘part and parcel of the law of the land’ is also abrogated: at the same time, and the coincidence is not an accident, it is becoming somewhat nearer the truth to say that the law of the land is part and parcel of Christianity. It must also be noticed

that *Christianity* was part and parcel of the articles of *war*: and so was duelling. Any officer speaking against religion was to be cashiered: and any officer receiving an affront, without, in the last resort, attempting to kill his opponent, was also to be cashiered."

The following is worthy of quotation, because of the amount of church history, which is compressed into it. But when one sees how admirably matters pertaining to theology, can really be expressed, it makes one indignant with the confusedness, verbosity, and ineffectiveness of most of the writing, which claims to be religious.

"Among the books which in my younger days were in some orthodox publication lists—I think in the list of the Christian Knowledge Society, but I am not sure—was Locke's 'Reasonableness of Christianity.' It seems to have come down from the eighteenth century, when the battle was belief in Christ against unbelief, *simpliciter*, as the logicians say. Now if ever there were a Socinian book in the world, it is this work of Locke. 'These two,' says Locke, 'faith and repentance, i.e., believing Jesus to be the Messiah, and a good life, are the indispensable conditions of the New Covenant, to be performed by all those who would obtain eternal life.' All the book is amplification of this doctrine. Locke in this and many other things follows Hobbes, whose doctrine in the *Leviathan* is 'fidem, quanta ad salutem necessaria est, contineri in hoc articulo, Jesus est Christus.'* For this Hobbes was called an atheist, which many still believe him to have been: some of his contemporaries called him rightly a Socinian. Locke was known for a Socinian as soon as his work appeared. Dr. John Edwards, his assailant, says he is 'Socinianized all over.' Locke in his reply says, 'There is not one word of Socinianism in it.' And he was right. The positive Socinian doctrine has *not one word of Socinianism in it*. Socinianism consists in omissions. Locke and Hobbes did not dare *deny* the Trinity: for such a thing Hobbes might have been roasted, and Locke might have been strangled. Accordingly the well-known way of teaching Unitarian doctrine was the collection of the asserted essentials of Christianity, without naming the Trinity, &c. This is the plan which Newton followed, in the papers, which have at last been published."

* "Faith, so far as is necessary to salvation, is contained in this article, 'Jesus is the Christ.'"

In a note to this passage, it is said, —

"I use the word 'Socinian' because it was so much used in Locke's time; it is used in our own day, by the small fry, the unlearned clergy, and their immediate followers, as a term of reproach for all Unitarians. I suspect they have a kind of liking for the word: it sounds like *so sinful*."

If Prof. De Morgan had not been a brave and independent man, he would never have done for his wife what he did and dared. He wrote a long introduction, full of wit and logic, for Mrs. De Morgan's book, "From Matter to Spirit." The book with that title may be accounted as the best book extant on the philosophy of what is called Spiritualism. Some time after the publication of the volume, in a humorous notice of it, written by himself, as a reviewer, he says, —

"This preface retorts a little of that contempt which the 'philosophical world' has bestowed with heaped measure upon those who have believed their senses, and have drawn natural even if hasty inferences. There is philosopher-craft as well as priestcraft, both from one source, both of one spirit. In English cities and towns the minister of religion has been tamed: so many weapons are bared against him when he obtrudes his office in a dictatory manner that, as a rule, there is no more quiet and modest member of society than the urban clergyman. . . . But the overbearing minister of nature, who snaps you with *unphilosophical*, as the clergyman once frightened you with *infidel*, is still a recognized member of society, wants taming, and will get it. He wears the priest's cast-off clothes, dyed to escape detection: the better sort of philosophers would gladly set him to square the circle. . . . In spite of all this, A. B. [that is the Professor himself] boldly repeats that he feels assured of many of the facts of *Spiritualism*, and that he cannot pretend to affirm or deny anything about their cause."

In the handsome volume here reviewed, are interspersed many personal reminiscences by the author.

"Shortly after the publication of my article, a gentleman called at my house, and finding I was not at home, sent up his card — with a stylish West End club on it — to my wife, begging for a few words on pressing business. With many well-expressed apologies,

he stated that he had been alarmed by hearing that Prof. De Morgan had an intention of altering Easter next year. Mrs. De Morgan kept her countenance, and assured him that I had no such intention, and further that she greatly doubted my having the power to do it. Was she quite sure? His authority was very good: fresh assurances given. He was greatly relieved, for he had some horses training for after Easter, which would not be ready to run, if it were altered the wrong way. A doubt comes over him: would Mrs. De Morgan, in the event of her being mistaken, give him the very earliest information? Promise given: profusion of thanks; more apologies; and departure."

Here is an anecdote of a geometrician, who was not as wide awake, in a worldly way, as the gentleman who was anxious about the racing calendar. It is a story that was told, though with some difference of detail, by Lord Brougham.

"He used to sit at his open window, on a ground floor, as deep in geometry as a Robert Simson ought to be. Here he would be accosted by beggars, to whom he generally gave a trifle: he roused himself to hear a few words of the story, made his donation, and instantly dropped down into his depths. Some wags one day stopped a man who was on his way to the window with, 'Now, my man, do as we tell you, and you will get something from that gentleman, and a shilling besides from us. You will go and say you are in distress: he will ask you who you are: and you will say you are Robert Simson, son of John Simson, of Kirktonhill.' The wags watched a little, and saw him rouse himself again, and exclaim, 'Robert Simson, son of John Simson, of Kirktonhill! Why, that is myself. That man must be an impostor.'"

The following instances are amusing of inefficiency utterly unconscious of itself, because of being in places of authority:—

"A pupil of mine, who had passed on to Cambridge, was desired by his college tutor to solve a certain cubic equation,—one of an integer root of two figures. In a minute the work and answer were presented by Horner's method. 'How!' said the tutor. 'This cannot be, you know.' 'There is the answer, sir,' said my pupil, greatly amused; for my pupils learned not only Horner's method,

but the estimation it held at Cambridge. 'Yes!' said the tutor. 'There is the answer, certainly; but it *stands to reason* that a cubic equation cannot be solved in this space.' He then sat down, went through a process about ten times as long, and then said, with triumph, 'There, that is the way to solve a cubic equation!'

"I think the tutor in this was never matched except by the country organist. A master of the instrument went into the organ-loft during the service, and asked the organist to let him *play the congregation out*: consent was given. The stranger, when the time came, began a voluntary which made the people open their ears, and wonder who had got into the loft: they kept their places to enjoy the treat. When the organist saw this, he pushed the interloper off the stool with, 'You'll never play 'em out this side Christmas.' He then began his own drone; and the congregation began to move quietly away. 'There,' said he, 'that's the way to play 'em out!'"

Says our author, "I have not scrupled to bear hard on my own University, on the Royal Society, and on other respectable existences: being very much the friend of all." He lived to see Cambridge as a University become a very different place from what it was, when he resided there as a student. And his words and opinions about some other institutions, as published in this volume, will have their weight.

A man to keep men right,—and mathematician though he was, and logician, yet, like Tennyson's ideal poet, "dowered with the hate of hate and scorn of scorn,"—that is what Prof. De Morgan was. Few men in England, these last ten years, have died in greater distinction, or have drawn after them, on going hence, more affectionate remembrance than Augustus De Morgan.

"As earth turns sunward for its light,
As flowers drink in the dew;
So our whole being seeks the bright,
The beautiful, and true,"

TOPICS OF THE MONTH.

BY THE EDITOR.

PUBLIC MORALS.

IN all countries, under every form of government and through all ages, political power has had an unfavorable influence on the morals of those connected with it. Government is established for the administration of justice. But in order to sustain a government, great powers must be placed in the hands of those who make, and those who execute the laws, and great powers are almost always injurious to the character of those who exercise them. Hence it has almost always happened that the centre of a powerful government is also a centre of corruption. Even when the head of the government is a man of unquestionable honesty, there is, among the thousands of public functionaries, room for all the intrigues by which offices and money may be gained. The greater the country, the more complicated the matters which enter into its legislation, the more numerous the offices and the greater the amount of money to be distributed or acted upon, the greater will be the peril to the public morals.

These are facts recognized by most thoughtful men who have looked at all into the subject. In this country, during the last forty years especially, we have been pursuing a course which is rapidly increasing the dangers here alluded to, both in our national and state governments. General laws for the public good may be made and administered with comparative safety. But the moment legislation begins to discriminate between classes, allowing privileges to one class at the expense of another, it enters on a course so perilous that it can be justified only by very strong considerations of public necessity or expediency. All taxes on foreign importations for the encouragement of particular branches of industry are liable to this objection. Special privileges granted in perpetuity to corporations are of a similar character. All special legislation for particular interests, associations or individuals,

is full of peril to the government, on account of the close connection which it establishes between members of the government and powerful parties outside who are ready to bring all available influences to bear upon the legislation of the country.

Now these questionable and dangerous kinds of legislation have been gaining ground both in our national and state legislatures, till vast pecuniary interests have come to be associated with them in such a way as to threaten their independence and their moral integrity. The country is groaning under the burdens imposed upon it by excessive legislation. Members of Congress are besieged by interested parties who demand that these or those laws shall be passed on account of the influence which they will have on their business. Able counsel are employed to press particular claims on individual members or legislative committees. The lobbies are thronged. Outside parties and influences determine how the members shall vote. Our legislatures are no longer deliberate bodies where great public questions are discussed and decided on public grounds. Partizan influences are bad enough. But even they are ten times less injurious, and lead to results far less fatal, than the personal pressure of great pecuniary interests. The evil has been gaining ground for many years, till at last it has arrived at such a magnitude as to cause in the community at large a painful sense of distrust and alarm.

During the present session of Congress specific charges having been made against a few individuals of high standing and influence, the public attention has been turned towards them, and a disposition is shown to visit severe penalties on them, as if they were sinners above all the rest. It will be well to make examples of them if a clear case be proved against them, to show our sense of the wrong which they have sanctioned by their conduct. But the evil or the crime is not confined to them. Mr. Ames and Mr. Brooks and Mr. Colfax, though their names begin with the three first letters in the alphabet, are probably better men than the majority of those who would divert attention from themselves by voting for the expulsion of their associates.

We have no disposition to shelter individuals from the consequences of their own acts because others who pass unconvicted may be worse men than they are. But as conservators of the public morals, it becomes us to recognize the full extent of the evil, and to condemn, not merely two or three or half a dozen men, who are singled out for the national pillory, but the whole pernicious practice which has gained such ascendancy among us. Why do our rich men and our great monied associations and corporations take such pains to get men into Congress who will look after their particular interests? Why do they go to Washington, themselves, or through their agents, to press upon the attention of the government the particular measures which will be most advantageous to them? Are not these facts evidence that they are willing to use illegitimate influences with our legislators, and thus corrupt, at their source, the fountains of law and justice and public morals. Good men, at least men who appear to be good at home and at church, do not hesitate to follow up in this way legislators whose votes in their favor they may hope thus to secure. They may not offer money to influence a vote. They may not directly hold out a bribe. But in the personal, social, convivial, or political influences which they bring to bear upon them, and by which they hope to secure their votes, are they not tampering with the honest purposes and independent convictions of our legislators? Men who directly or indirectly attempt in such ways to influence legislation have no right to cast a stone at Mr. Ames or Mr. Brooks.

The evil is too wide spread to be removed by single examples of summary punishment. It runs through the whole fabric of our civilization. When Rome had reached such a state of morals that a pecuniary price was put on everything it was easy to predict the early downfall of the nation. When everything is for sale, when public virtue and private honor recognize a price which justifies them in selling out, when the merchant who would not think of repudiating a bargain by which he is to lose a hundred dollars fails in his ability to stand by his integrity, if it requires the sacrifice of

many thousands, when the blandishments of wealth enter largely into the romantic dreams of the young and the dearest affections have also their price for entering into the closest relations, when Christian churches and Christian ministers haggle with one another about the salary which is to be paid, and everything is reducing itself to a money standard, it hardly becomes us to single out a few members of Congress as exceptional cases and vent on them our indignation. We are all, more or less, bound up in the same offense. We all are guilty. And it becomes us to seek for ourselves a higher standard, a grander ideal of life and happiness and true prosperity. When in our secret thought and outward conduct we recognize the Christian rule as the supreme law and joy of living, we shall be able to do something to abate the spread of an evil which is threatening to subvert and destroy both government and people.

CREDIT MOBILIER.

It is not an unusual thing for our people to make up for long-continued and general habits of moral indifference or laxity of principle by sudden fits of virtuous endeavor or momentary outbursts of moral indignation. Going through these occasional spasms of virtuous feeling, we look upon ourselves as among the elect, and thus make amends for the little heed we give to our common every-day conduct. Another danger we are liable to is passing judgment on the actions of prominent men. We judge them in the light of a knowledge which neither we nor they could have had at the time the actions in question were done. Some person was commenting severely on the conduct of Sir John Moore during the brief campaign in which he lost his life in Spain. The Duke of Wellington replied that it was unfair to condemn a general on account of facts which could not have been known by him at the time.

Both these reasons, we believe, are now operating with undue severity on those who were connected with the Credit Mobilier. We understand the case to have been as follows. At the close of the war, it was of immense importance to the

government and the people of the United States, that a railroad connecting the Atlantic and Pacific states should be built. Every year's delay was a loss which could hardly be estimated. Surveys had been made. Companies were formed. The government had proposed very liberal offers. But the funds could not be raised. Capitalists did not believe in the project. So matters stood for a long time, and no competent person was willing to take upon himself the very heavy responsibilities of the enterprise. At length Mr. Oakes Ames, then a member of Congress, and his brother Oliver, men of extraordinary business enterprise and ability, of unsullied reputation and of very large means, looked into the subject, and seeing its vast importance to the country, came to the conclusion that some means might be devised by which to carry it through. The bonds and land grants and other privileges offered by the government were not strong enough inducements to persuade capitalists to take up the stock and advance the necessary funds for so momentous an undertaking.

Another company, therefore, called the *Credit Mobilier*, was made use of, being composed substantially of the same persons as the Pacific Rail Road Company. This new company, with comparatively a small capital, was to build the road in instalments at certain fixed prices, and take the railroad stock and bonds and the government bonds in payment for their work. Most capitalists stood aloof at the time, not because of any moral scruples, but because they did not believe the *Credit Mobilier* promised a safe and profitable investment for their money. But as the work went on, and section after section of the road, which could not then have been built in any other way, was completed, the difficulties were found to be much less formidable than had been apprehended, and immense profits were finally secured. We know nothing of the details of the enterprise. But placing ourselves beside Mr. Ames and his associates, and judging, as most capitalists did at the beginning, of the great hazards involved in such an undertaking, should the facts of its extraordinary success afterwards lead us to condemn the whole thing as unprincipled and

immoral? These men were risking all the large accumulations of years, and on the face of such liabilities ought they not to be able to see before them a chance also for very great gains?

In carrying out a work of such unwieldy proportions, so entirely beyond the means of any single individual, it was for the interest of all concerned to have the countenance of able and influential men,—men of large pecuniary resources and of great public influence. Every such enterprise when it proves to be a success has its powerful enemies to contend against. All the legislation that was needed or desired had been secured from Congress before the work was begun. No man's vote was wanted. But it was important to secure the good will of the public. For this reason, after it became known that the undertaking would be successful and when the stock had risen in value, shares were offered at par to a few prominent men, some of them members of Congress. This may have been wrong. It certainly was a mistake, whatever may have been the motive. But there is no evidence that anything in return was expected, or that Mr. Ames had any other particular end in view than to secure a good investment for persons in whom he had a kindly interest. Undoubtedly he wished to make a general favorable impression upon them. But we see no evidence of anything further. The amount of stock offered, except in a single instance, was ridiculously small, if he intended it as a bribe. We can easily understand how under the circumstances of the case a generous, kind-hearted man such as Mr. Ames was reputed to be, of great wealth, might desire, when he could do it as well as not, to help some of his friends of small means to profit by what he then felt sure was to be a good investment. We have known able business men of great wealth to bestow similar advantages on ministers and other personal friends who had little property and no business faculty or knowledge, where no return could possibly be made, and where no motive could possibly be suspected beyond the wish to do a kindness. And we have honored them for so doing. If the matter had ended with the purchase of a few shares of the Credit Mobilier stock

by a few of Mr. Ames's friends, some in Congress and some out of Congress, we do not see how there would have been any good ground, so far as the evidence goes, for suspecting either him or them of any wicked purpose. And we do not believe that there was on either side any wrong intention.

The wrong began at a later date. When, in the midst of an exciting presidential election, the charge was made against prominent statesmen that they had been bribed by the gift of stock in the *Credit Mobilier*, if they had simply stated the truth, that they had bought a few shares which Ames had allowed them to take on the same terms on which he and his original associates had taken them, and they held this property as they held bank stock, manufacturing stock, or any other property which might be affected by legislation, their reputation as public men would have suffered no harm. But the specious and indignant denials which they made of having anything to do with it, as if it had been an unclean thing, and the falsehood implied in these denials even where they may have been so phrased as to be literally true, have produced a most painful impression in regard to the integrity and honor of our public men. Here is where they have done a great and irretrievable wrong. Mr. Ames in his early attempts "to let them off as easy as possible," has very seriously injured his reputation for veracity. The whole truth told at the first as he has told it since, would have left them and him with no serious imputation against them. Mr. Wilson, the most scrupulous perhaps of all our public men, took the stock at first with no consciousness of impropriety in so doing, but gave it up afterwards from apprehensions for which we honor him, but which could not have been of a very grave character. Mr. Dawes, whose integrity and high sense of honor no one calls in question, at first engaged to take the stock offered to him, and afterwards gave it up, not because of impropriety in holding it, but because he feared that the whole concern might be involved in a troublesome lawsuit.

The reputation of our public men is too precious a possession for the country to be trifled with. One of the most painful circumstances connected with this whole matter is

the savage satisfaction which is evidently taken by many persons in blasting the good name of men who have stood high in the public regard. Even "The Nation," which takes high moral ground in the treatment of such subjects, has seemed to us to be not always quite free from the imputation of joining with a keen zest in hunting down the envied reputation of some distinguished statesman.

As public moralists and journalists, looking with a jealous eye to everything that can have a bearing on public life and morals, we must beware of falling in with the crowd of careless observers, and adopting their sentiments without a very close examination of the grounds on which they rest. The good name of a public man is not only of inestimable value to himself, but it is even more valuable to the country. Accusations are easily made and circulated, even when entirely without foundation. Unfortunately, in the present instance, the foolish panic on the part of the accused, and their evident evasion of the truth, are what throw the greatest difficulties in the way of their exculpation.

Upon the whole, however, we believe that good will come of the free overhauling and investigation of this matter. In the first place, all lovers of scandal must be disappointed in not finding transactions more damaging to the characters of the accused than any which have yet been brought to light. In the second place, the certainty that all secret intrigues and acts of dishonesty and corruption in public places may be exposed with merciless severity to the eyes of the world cannot but have a salutary effect. If the most desperate and abandoned politicians and men of sterling integrity are beyond the reach of such considerations, it can hardly fail to have a restraining influence on men who enter Congress, as many do, with a general good reputation for honesty, but with no very firm and independent convictions of right or principles of integrity and honor.

For ourselves, we have no personal interest in this matter, and no personal acquaintance with the parties implicated beyond an hour's conversation with one of them some years ago in a public place. Our first concern is for purity in

those who make and administer the laws. A high standard of honor there is of infinite importance to the country. It is too much to ask that no member of the government should hold property which may be affected by the action of the government; for almost every kind of property—farms, merchandise, railroads, manufactures, machinery—may be so affected. But no legislator ought to vote on a question which is likely to have any serious bearing on his own personal interests. Next to our regard to the purity of our public men is our concern for their good name, unless where they have forfeited it by their own misconduct. Washington is a dangerous place to the morals of men in authority there. But we know that some of our ablest and most prominent men there are men of the highest moral qualities. This fact does not always secure them from reproach. The eye of the envious, the tongue of the slanderer, the heated passions of partizan strife, are watching them, and seeking always for some opportunity to throw suspicion upon their conduct or their motives. The public welfare, the cause of public morals, the national health and honor, require that we should not condemn them on light or unfounded charges, but only on full conviction, after a careful, impartial, and thorough investigation.

We wish not to be misunderstood. We do not approve of all the transactions connected with the *Credit Mobilier*. What we say is, that, after a careful examination of the evidence and the report of Judge Poland's Committee, we find no proof that there was any intention of bribing members of Congress, or any disposition on their part to be bribed. This much, however, we do find. Mr. Ames wished to place the stock "where it would do them the most good," that is, as we understand it, with men of property and men of influence, whether in Congress or not. And just here is the line which cannot be too carefully observed by our public men, and by those who would influence them in the discharge of their official duties. Mr. Ames may only have desired to do a kindness to persons whom he respected, and to secure their good will and their attention to the subject in case the great

pecuniary interests which he represented should get into difficulty or be brought before Congress. We do not believe that he had any thought of bribing them. But he ought most scrupulously to have observed the line which separates members of Congress from private citizens. He ought to have had too great a respect for his and their official position as members of Congress, and too great a respect for his and their reputation, to do anything which could be construed into an attempt to influence them in their official duties by pecuniary considerations. Here certainly we find in him evidence of a lack of the sensitive and delicate regard to honor which is the crowning glory of a public man, and for want of which our national and state legislatures are losing the confidence of the people. Men who are holding high positions in powerful monied corporations, or who are very largely interested in them, sometimes seek a seat in our legislatures mainly for the purpose of advancing the interests of those corporations. This is all wrong, and it is doing an infinite deal of mischief. Such men ought not to be chosen. Some of them are men of great business talent and enterprise, and in other respects men of integrity. But in their action on legislative bodies they are pursuing a course which must be fatal to all attempts at just legislation, and which is doing more, we believe, than any other single influence to corrupt our legislatures, to undermine the public foundations of justice and honor, and thus lessen all the public securities on which our personal rights and possessions rest.

PROF. TYNDALL.

The lecturing tour of Prof. Tyndall in this country might be regarded almost as an ovation to science. We cannot but think of it as an omen of good to our country. A town which depends entirely on one pursuit, however prosperous it may seem to be, holds its prosperity by a precarious tenure. The people whose life is sustained by only one set of ideas has but a meagre, one-sided prospect before it. Even religion and morals, viewed in themselves apart from all intellectual tendencies and influences, may narrow our minds

and make us a nation of bigots. The larger the number of honest pursuits which can be profitably sustained in a place, the more is its prosperity secured against any general declension, and the more many-sided and symmetrical is the life that is going on within it. So, likewise, the more various the culture among a people, the grander and finer will be the specimens of character which they exhibit. We are not among those who deify science, or who look to it as a panacea for all human ills. It is a very noble pursuit. It is doing a great work in laying open the secrets and resources of the physical universe, and in training human minds by the search after truth. It should hold a very high, but not the highest, place in the education of the individual and the race. Literature, in its broadest sense, embracing within itself the greatest works of poetic genius, is a more elevating, enlarging, and ennobling influence than science. History, in its broadest sense, ranging through the whole sphere of human achievements, opens a grander world of inquiry than physical science. Religion, which in its broadest sense includes all knowledge and all pursuits, giving unity and consistency to them all, as it throws the light of heaven around them and brings them all within the workings of the Infinite Mind, is higher, greater, more comprehensive and all-pervading than science. But when it cuts itself loose from poetry and history and science, from the laws alike of mind and matter, and demands immediate and unreasoning obedience as the only condition of salvation, the wise, benignant, and beneficent Ruler of the universe becomes a tyrant. That which should be the source of our deepest joy, prompting to the grandest efforts, unfolding within us our noblest faculties and our holiest and highest life, chills and paralyzes our best powers, as it lays its stern and palsying hand upon us.

We here in New England were once a theocracy. Then we grew into a nation intensely realistic and practical. We have a sort of respect for learning. But the highest type of respectability is the successful merchant. The offices of religion have helped to establish the sacredness of property, and therefore they are to be sustained. Governments and states-

men, judges and lawyers, have helped to secure the rights of property, and therefore they are to be honored. Scientific men, civil engineers, inventors, and mechanics lay open and bring within our reach the wealth of the world, and therefore they are to be respected. Schools and colleges prepare men to be producers on a larger scale, and therefore they are to be supported. But the genuine king, he who is to rule in his own right, and be respected for what he is and has, is the great merchant,—he who controls the greatest amount of money. Knowledge is a means of gaining power. Government is a means of securing power. But wealth *is* power. Whatever it demands for its security is sacred. Here is the tendency of the age. The seat of this mammon worship is in our great commercial centres, but its dominion is exercised with hardly less severity in every country town, where all hearts turn towards the accumulation of wealth as the one great end of our being.

This is the danger of our times, and we are glad to have a prevalent enthusiasm on some other theme. Mr. Agassiz has done a great good to the many young men who have come under his influence, in teaching them to honor science for its own sake and not for its pecuniary advantages and rewards. With a grand sense of honor and dignity he has refused to make his office of searching after truth subordinate to any mercenary ends. His example has not been without its effect. And now Prof. Tyndall, in many of our great cities, has been doing the same good work. It is refreshing to hear words like these ringing out their healthful instructions in the great mart of the nation. They are taken from his parting speech in New York. The closing paragraph especially we commend to our readers.

“I went with Prof. Agassiz through the great institution of which he is the head, and I had occasion to observe the manner of working with his pupils, and I will say once for all, and with all sincerity, that if from those pupils men do not spring, able and willing to carry the fire of investigation forward, it is not, in my opinion, the fault of the master there.

“The interest shown in my lectures cannot have been the crea-

tion of the hour. Every such display of public sympathy must have its prelude, during which men's minds are prepared, a desire for knowledge created, an intelligent curiosity aroused. Then in the nick of time comes a person, who, though but an accident, touches a spring which permits tendency to flow into fact, and public feeling to pass from the potential to the actual. The interest displayed has really been the work of years, and the chief merit rests with those who were wise enough to discern that, as regards physics, the detent might be removed and the public sympathy for that department of science permitted to show itself.

"As I said in my lectures, the willingness of American citizens to throw their fortunes into the cause of public education is without a parallel in my experience. Hitherto their efforts have been directed to the practical side of science, and this is why I sought in my lectures to show the dependence of practice on principles. On the ground, then, of mere practical, material utility, pure science ought to be cultivated. But assuredly among your men of wealth there are those willing to listen to an appeal on higher grounds, to whom, as American citizens, it will be a pride to fashion American men so as to enable them to take their places among those great ones mentioned in my lectures. Into this plea I would pour all my strength. Not as a servant of Mammon do I ask you to take science to your hearts, but as the strengthener and enlightener of the mind of man.

"Might I now address a word or two to those who in the ardo of youth feel themselves drawn towards science as a vocation? They must, if possible, increase their fidelity to original research, prizing far more than the possession of wealth an honorable standing in science. They must, I think, be prepared at times to suffer a little for the sake of scientific righteousness, not refusing, should occasion demand it, to live low and lie hard to achieve the object of their lives. I do not here urge anything upon others that I should have been unwilling to do myself when young. Let me give you a line of personal history. By some means or other, gentlemen, the people of this country have begotten and fostered a strange confidence in me toward them. I feel as if I, a simple scientific student, who never taught the world to be a cent richer, who merely sought to present science to the world as an intellectual good, am leaving not a group of friends merely, not merely a friendly city, but a friendly continent here behind me. The very disappointment of the West I take as a measure of the West's friendship.

Tested and true hearts are awaiting me at the other side, and thinking of them and you the pure cold intellect is for the moment deposed, and what is called the 'human heart' becomes master of the situation; but lest it, in the waywardness of strong emotion, should utter anything which the re-enthroned intellect of to-morrow might condemn, I will pause here."

REV. JOSEPH ALLEN. D.D.

Died in Northborough, on Sunday morning, February 23d, Rev. Joseph Allen, D.D., aged eighty-two years and six months.

If we had been asked at any time within twenty years for the finest, truest, and most successful examples of a country minister that we have known, we should not have hesitated a moment to reply, Levi W. Leonard, of Dublin, N.H., and Joseph Allen, of Northborough, Mass. The men were very unlike. And yet in prominent traits of character, in method of action and influence, and in the beneficent results of their labors, they were very much alike. Both were earnest, devout men. Both were unwearied in their efforts to enlighten and improve their own minds and the minds of those around them. Both identified themselves with their people, and were interested in their trials, sorrows, enjoyments, reverses, and successes, as if they had been their own. They lived in their people as parents sometimes live in their children, touched by every influence and every wave of fortune or of feeling that moved them. They gave themselves especially to the young, watching them with parental interest from their earliest years, extending to them the best means of intellectual, moral, and religious training, and following them with thoughtful care through all their changing vicissitudes and experiences, never in after years losing sight of one who had once been numbered among the lambs of their flock. We cannot think of such men without a silent benediction.

Joseph Allen was born in Medfield in 1791, was graduated at Harvard College in 1811, and settled as the minister of the town of Northborough in 1816, where he continued in his sacred office for nearly fifty-seven years. During the greater

part of that time he was the leading influence in that pleasant town, originating and carrying forward every good enterprise which looked to the improvement and well-being of its people. He was the guiding and inspiring genius in the public schools. Forty-two years ago, four students of Harvard College went to Northborough as teachers during the winter months. They reached their boarding places, in different parts of the town, on Saturday. On Sunday, at church, the schools, which were to be opened the next morning, were the subject of the minister's discourse, and these young men found themselves placed in a prominent and responsible position before the people of the town. They were invited to be at the pastor's house on Monday evening, where the best means of making the schools interesting and profitable were discussed by the wise pastor and the inexperienced teachers. This close attention to the schools, and an intimate relation between the minister and the school-masters, went on through the whole winter, and excited a wonderful degree of intellectual activity and enthusiasm among the young people of the town.

This is a single instance of Dr. Allen's method of action. It went through everything that could affect the best interests of the people. He was a clear thinker, and had the command of a lucid English style which was admirably adapted to his plain common-sense instructions in religion and morals. His preaching was the wise, affectionate talk of a father to his children. But his paternal feelings, instead of allowing him to fall into a careless, slipshod habit of preparing sermons, prompted him always to do his best.

Many of the characteristics which Chaucer singled out in his delightful description of a country parson applied to this wise, affectionate, and laborious man.

"A good man there was of religion,
That was a poore Parson of a town,
But rich he was of holy thought and work :
He was also a learned man, a Clerk,
That Christ's gospel truly would preach.
.
.
.
He dwelt at home and kept well his fold,
.
.
.
.

And though he holy were, and virtuous,
He was to sinful men not despitous.

To drawn folk to heaven with faireness,
By good example was his business.

He waited after no pomp or reverence,
Nor maked him no spiced conscience ;
But Christ's love, and his apostles twelve
He taught, and first he followed it himselfe."

We should delight to follow this good man through his many experiences, and show how he instructed and elevated his people, how he engaged them in all good works and studies, how he was assisted in his labors of love by a very gifted and lovely wife who identified her interests with his, how his children grew up around him rich in all the virtues, attainments, and endowments which he loved and honored, and how by their example his influence was enlarged and heightened ; how he had his trials and his sorrows which only endeared him the more and made him more truly a minister of Christ to those who had looked up to him ; how he took boys into his family to teach them and thus gain the means of educating his own children ; how he made books for Sunday schools, and what a place those books filled for many years ; how he bore up under the infirmities of age, and how with the sweetness and gentleness of a child he went to his last sleep, a little weary perhaps, but without pain or grief, and how those with whom he has lived for two generations arise up and bless him as they think of all the benefactions which his life has brought upon them. These and more than these we would gladly mention, but as we call him once more before us and with our benediction dismiss him to the richer benedictions which await him among just made perfect, we can only repeat with tears of thankful love and honor, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord : for they rest from their labors and their works do follow them."

MISS BELL.

We have for years been interested in the work which Miss Bell has been doing for the poor whites on Harker's Island.

A friend of ours, in whose judgment we have perfect confidence, spent a month with Miss Bell last year, and has given a very interesting and hopeful account of what she has done and is now doing. She calls her place on Harker's Island, Grew Farm, in honor of Mrs. Jane Grew, of Boston, one of her earliest and most constant friends, — a lady whose name was associated with all that was generous, and whose death was a heavy loss, not only to her immediate friends, but to many suffering ones whom her ready sympathy sought out, and to many a cause of humanity which she esteemed it a joy and privilege to aid.

We publish a few extracts from our friend's account of what Miss Bell has done for nine years, and is now doing on the Island.

"Here the men and boys are taught practical farming, under the personal supervision of Miss Bell, and are shown the capabilities of the island, on which the people affirmed nothing could be raised. The good effects of this labor are seen now, in the garden patches about their own cabins, and in the eagerness with which they take any flowers for cultivation at home.

"Close by is the red school-house where Miss Bell teaches four hours daily, for about seven months in the year, the common English branches. The children are bright, and interested in their lessons; cleanliness is taught as a cardinal virtue, and the young men and women will be respectable members of the community.

"Sabbath day there is a school, and a morning meeting where Miss Bell teaches the simple gospel truth. A bell lately presented by a friend will soon send out its welcome sound to gather the people. Occasionally a minister from Beaufort or elsewhere preaches to them and finds welcome. Some rough shelves bear at present the few books, collected for the use of the young people, who read eagerly biographies, histories, and so forth, of which there is a judicious selection.

"On this island is carried on as successful a mission as can be found anywhere. Whatever is given goes directly to the object, which is the education, enlightenment, and Christianizing of the people of Harker's Island. Before many years this will be a self-supporting mission, but there are many obstacles to preclude that at present.

"Miss Bell's influence is felt through all the region, and she desires earnestly that her hands may be strengthened. She is about fifty years of age, and the vicissitudes and changes of her life have fitted her well for this arduous work. With all her decision, she has great tact with these people, and to them she is *the law*. She sympathizes in their joys and sorrows, feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, visits the sick, and is absorbed thoroughly in their interests. Here is a solitary life, with no society for an educated person, and few could endure it for any length of time.

"In her little cottage the art of living is reduced to a primitive simplicity, and the most rigid economy is practiced compatible with a decent degree of comfort. Four little children find shelter, food, and clothing beneath her roof. This summer, in the life of trust she leads, she sees in the future some provision for them and others that may be added to their number. M."

NEW YORK CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY.

We always take especial satisfaction in reading the annual reports of Mr. J. Earle Williams, the treasurer of this most useful and beneficent society. This year, as some one said to us, his report reads like a jubilant song of thanksgiving. And well it may do so in looking back on the work of the society for the past year, or for the past twenty years, during which it has spent in its works of mercy more than one million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. During the past year it has paid out a hundred and fifty-nine thousand dollars. It has removed from the city to new homes, during the twenty years, twenty-eight thousand six hundred and seventy-seven children, of whom three thousand four hundred and sixty-two were provided for during the last year. What is meant by this change from filth, idleness, starvation, and vice to employment, comfort, and virtuous homes, it would be difficult for us to describe. In the words of the report, —

"It would not be easy, were one so disposed, to overstate the importance of getting poor children to rich fields. If only our friends could know the harrowing scenes of wretchedness seen and described by Mr. Dupuy in his visits in the neighborhood of schools we have recently established on Avenue C and on Water Street!

Of 'the little boy who never had any shoes,' the sickly mothers, the drunken husbands, starving children! One child supplied with double share of bread on Friday at our school that he might take it home to keep the others alive till Monday! Appalling poverty, shameless crimes, and beastly degradation!

"Contrast this revolting picture of city low life with the bright, glowing, hopeful picture Mr. Fry draws (in his report of twenty-one pages) of the homes he has recently visited where children had been placed in families by the Children's Aid Society five years before. He found them happy inmates of respectable homes,—loving and beloved,—varying now in ages from seven to twenty-three years, well, contented, thriving. Some were practically adopted into families, others quite indispensable to the happiness and welfare of those who had taken them, half in charity, a few years before.

"The difference between the places they went from and those they now occupy may be imagined, but not described.

"Let us all, then, feel it our duty, our pleasure, and our privilege to do all we can to get the homeless into homes!"

We cannot leave the subject without referring to the similar and parent institution here which was fostered into life and usefulness by the same gentleman who for twenty years has been at the head of this work of love and mercy in New York. The Children's Mission is engaged in the same work. It has been always admirably managed. Its presiding officer has given his hand and his heart to it. Those who work with him are worthy of their calling, and their efforts have been blessed by a great success. But they need constant aid from all who sympathize with them in their labors.

"KEEP the stream of good deeds agitated. Never allow the waters to stagnate. If thou hast no earthly goods to give, let the kind word, the loving glance, the tender pressure of the hand, reveal the flow of sympathy within."

RANDOM READINGS.

BY E. H. SEARS.

THE GALLOWS is a hideous blot on the civilization of the age, whatever the final verdict may be on the question of capital punishment. If a farmer had a dangerous animal, and should string him up by the neck to a tree, leaving him there to writhe in agony till he choked to death, we should say he ought to be indicted for brutality and cruelty. If he should invite his neighbors beforehand, men, women, and boys, to feast on the spectacle, we should say he ought to be indicted as a corrupter of the morals of the neighborhood. Every humane person would say to him, "If your dog must be put out of the way, find some method more merciful than that." Common butchers, who have the common instinct of humanity, find a way of dispatching their victims which is comparatively painless. But men and women are hanged by the neck, and it depends on the skill and humanity of the executioner how long, or how short, the agony shall be. Any way, it is a shameful method of extinguishing life in any one who wears the human form, no matter how perverted that life may have been. It is an insult to human nature to treat any man as we would not treat our cats and dogs even when they go mad and become dangerous. There are ways of extinguishing life which are more decent, and which would comport somewhat with our conceptions of the dignity and value of human nature, kindled with a life which is to burn on forever.

So, too, the policy of sending a man on short notice into another world, with his crimes all flush upon his soul, is manifestly inhuman and cruel. It is tenfold inhuman on the orthodox theory that eternal torture, or possible salvation, hangs on the thread of this mortal life. If God gives the rest of us space for repentance which we never merited, why should not we give it to the poor fellow sinners whose lives we take into our custody?

We are not prepared to say that the time has come for the abolition of the death-penalty with entire safety to society. But the time has certainly come for the infliction of all penalties with a more even-handed justice. Murder and robbery go free because courts and juries wink at them; and then in a spasm of justice a few poor devils are hung to quiet the public conscience,—and then murder has its carnival again. Bank robbers and defaulters, because accom-

plished and educated scoundrels, are compounded with or go free ; and finally, when the meshes of the law are fine enough to catch one and put him in jail, he is pardoned out because a long list of respectable gentlemen take pity upon him and sign a petition for his release. The recent pardon of Daniels, who robbed the Webster Bank, offers a premium of forty-six thousand dollars to like villains and defaulters henceforth. That Stokes has forfeited his life, we do believe. But if he had killed the whole gang of Erie and Tammany swindlers, he could not have been a worse foe to society than the men who corrupt the fountains of justice.

A SCENE IN THE CHICAGO UNITARIAN CONFERENCE we find reported in "The New Covenant,"—by the way, a very ably conducted weekly paper, the organ of Western Universalism. We give the extract, which describes the debate, with the comment thereon by the editor of "The Covenant." The debate must have produced a decided sensation in the audience.

"Mr. Weiss, of Boston, read an essay advocating 'Free Religion,' on which Rev. Robert Laird Collier is reported, in 'The Tribune,' to have said, that he heard the essay only in part, but, notwithstanding that he had listened attentively, he could not say that he had been able to catch the thread upon which the essay might have been hung. He said he was obliged to Mr. Weiss for the talk he had given them, but that the statements of Mr. Weiss were unhistoric and untrue. It was false that the people did not need theology. The people were now looking more towards religion, and the cross of Christ, than ever before. He said he had often thought he never would go into a Unitarian Conference again. He did not wish it reported in 'The Chicago Tribune' that he was in a meeting where some men shut the Bible out, and advanced the theory that the kingdom of God could be built upon the kingdom of the world. It was opposed to the foundation of his labors. He rested all things upon the Bible, and his faith was founded upon that. Mr. Weiss' theory of harmonies and facts was cold and heartless. It destroyed all faith, because it made faith rest upon those things only which were understood. He spoke strongly against the essay, and created quite a sensation by his energetic demurrer.

"And in reply to a criticism he added, 'in a positive, sarcastic manner,' 'Mr. Chairman, am I to be taken to task for criticising Mr. Weiss? Why is he to be taken in the hands of the people and defended like a child? Why, he is a great man. He came out from Boston, and can defend himself. I shall say what I want, if the whole Radical Club were here. I say again that it was against the spirit of the Bible, and opposed to the precepts of the Lord Jesus Christ, and I will not sit still and listen to such things.'

"This is a sound position to take, but it surprises us, inasmuch as Mr. Collier indulged in what seemed a very different sentiment, in our hearing, in the Universalist pulpit in Dubuque, Iowa, at the ordination of Mr. Pardee. He not only attributed the superiority of Jesus to other men to 'a fortunate strain of blood derived from David' (!), but he alluded to the Bible in such a manner as would have compelled us to protest had not the privileges of hospitality forbidden. The reference to the Bible was painful to us, and was far more in accord with Mr. Weiss' 'Act of Faith' than with his nervous and manly protest last week. Is it a case of sudden conversion? If so, we thank God. If not, it is an inconsistency we cannot reconcile.

"We make these remarks because we daily see the necessity of being understood by the public. Universalists and Unitarians are known as Liberal Christians, and are popularly supposed to be about alike. They are, in many respects, but so far as Jesus Christ and the Bible are concerned our church stands a unit. We regard them as authority from which there is no appeal, and we utterly repudiate the latitudinarianism which too frequently is indulged in by many Unitarians. We wanted to say to the Dubuque audience that if Liberal Christianity stood for such statements of Jesus and the Bible as we understood Mr. Collier to make, the Universalist denomination and the Dubuque society are not Liberal Christian.

"But what we meant to say when we began this article is this, 'Does Mr. Collier present his views in his Dubuque or his Chicaco address? Under which king Benzonian speaks!'"

We know something of the opinions of Dr. Robert Laird Collier respecting the Bible, and the Christ of the New Testament, as those opinions have been uttered publicly and privately for five years. They have been uttered with a ringing clearness and a consistency which leave no room for mistake under which king he is enlisted. The fullness and fervency of his faith in the Christ of the New Testament as the Christ who inspires and leads on all human progress to-day, have given special power to his eloquence, as we have heard it, and been thrilled by it, on more occasions than one. What he said in the Universalist pulpit, in Dubuque, we do not know, but feel pretty sure it must have been something misunderstood and misconstrued by the editor of "The New Covenant." And if men with the bold and fervent evangelism of Mr. Collier, instead of resolving never to "go into a Unitarian Conference again," would resolve always to be there, and make the atmosphere too warm for any northeast drizzle of pantheism ever to chill its faith and devotion, the Conferences would be not only a blessing to all the churches within them, but very likely bring to them the blessings of pentecostal times.

PARKE GODWIN'S SPEECH, at the Tyndall New York festival, was as good as could be. The picture which he drew of science acting in its own sphere, in contrast with science out of its sphere, and pretending to knowledge which it has not, was admirable. The false pretensions of theology, ignoring science and encroaching on its domain, are ridiculous and bad enough. The false pretensions of science, ignoring theology and encroaching on its domain, are thus exposed :—

“That learned traveler, Dr. Lemuel Gulliver, in his authentic and veracious narrative called a ‘Voyage to Laputa,’ encounters a Doctor of the Academy of Lagoda, who was quite up to this modern mark. He possessed a machine, of which the drawings are given, into which you might throw a vocabulary, some bits of wood, a few pieces of paper, and then, by turning a crank, out of those rough materials would come a whole body of the arts and sciences,—folio volumes of philosophy, poetry, politics, and law, printed and bound, all complete, without any expense of labor or any assistance from genius and study.

“You say this is ridiculous; but it is not a whit more so than those more recent theories which would account for the universal frame of things—every part of a sculptured order and a luscious beauty, every part teeming with an intelligence that moves our wonder and delight—on mere mechanical principles. Then there is another of these outside teachers of science, but this one is entitled to the highest respect, though I think he rides a hobby beyond the capacity of the creature to carry, who contrives a vast process of cosmic evolutions, who tells us that a great while ago, ten thousand years,—no, a hundred million of millions of millions of years ago,—a nebulous gas was diffused through the immensity of space, which first twisted itself into a solar system, then into a world, then into layers of mineral strata, then into vegetable spirals, into animal motions, into human vortices called societies, into Iliads, Parthenons, and Shakespeares, and at last into a grand philosophy of evolution,—the crown and consummation of the whole; which may all be true, though the birth strikes me as hardly worthy of so long and so tremendous a parturition. Again, a third convinces himself and his admirers that the universe is considerably defective, and that, like Alphonse of Castile, if he had been consulted in the making of it, he could have given many useful hints towards its improvement; and so, too, when the deepest human instincts in all ages have repeated what the Hebrew peasant said, gazing into the clear depths of the eastern skies, ‘The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork,’ cries, ‘Pish, the heavens declare the glory of Copernicus, Kepler, and Newton.’ Then there is another French litterateur, who, with all his undeniable merits, masquerades a little too much in the habiliments of science, who is very sure that mind and motion are

but the obverse sides of the same essential phenomenon, the one coming in by the front door of the consciousness, and the other by the back door of the senses. When you talk, he says, of the martyr's faith, the hero's devotion, the mother's love, the poet's fancy, the artist's genius, the lover's rapture, you are only giving so many different names to so many different movements of little molecules in the brain, — up, down, hither and thither, this way and that way, &c.: but my opinion is that the ingenious gentleman, when he comes to the truth of the case, will find what he terms molecules are only maggots, of which a very fine specimen has found its cradle and home in his own capacious cranium. This is a clear case of Grub Street, as a friend remarks, getting into the Royal Society. Now, if this be science, we must exclaim with the poet, —

“O star-eyed science! are these wonders there
To waft us back a message of despair?”

AMEN, ALLALUJAH, AND GLORY are much more rational responses to our ear from a living audience than the senseless stamping and clapping which as we have noticed, often come from boys who like the fun, sometimes making the most foolish things which a speaker says the occasion of it. If the frozen surface of our Unitarian congregations could somehow be broken up by a hearty response from the pews, it would help the pulpit amazingly and induce a more living action and reaction between the speaker and his audience. One of our excellent Unitarian ministers told us awhile since that in his travels he got into a Methodist meeting, and was warmed up to the point of speaking. “Amen,” “Good,” “God bless you, brother, keep on,” kept coming from the people about him. “You have no idea,” said he, “what inspiration it gave me.” At length, after having been borne far on the tide of his enthusiasm, he felt constrained in common honesty to tell them he belonged to a different denomination. “That’s the best of it.” “Glory to God for his saints every where,” was the greeting with which he sat down. This freedom of the pews might sometimes lead to irregularities, and would be only appropriate for conference meetings, but a good deal of irregularity is better than being listless spectators of somebody’s sermons and prayers.

Indeed, the Methodist “amen” is not always pitched right. There was a woman who was in the habit of shouting in the wrong places. She was just as likely to amen the pains of hell as the glories of heaven, provided they were described with power and unction, and the elders told her that she must keep still till some brother had broken the ice, and then she might follow in his wake.

She chafed for awhile under this abridgment of her woman's rights ; but finally a sentiment from the speaker came out in such a ball of fire that she broke over, — "Amen to that, *hit or miss*," was the response, and the elders gave in, because the danger of free utterance was less than the danger of explosion.

What we should like exceedingly would be a liturgy for the regular service ; the response not to be muttered or mumbled by the congregation, but clearly and fervently given, — a liturgy flexible enough to admit of extemporaneous prayer when the minister is prompted to it by the spirit ; and for Conference meetings the "amen," "hit or miss," from either men or women, with full liberty of prophecy-ing, and all fear of the elders or the fear of man removed forever.

BAPTISM UNDER DIFFICULTIES. "What do you think of cutting a hole in the ice two and one-half feet thick to baptize new converts?" was one of the queries put to Henry Ward Beecher for solution. Answer: "Let him who can stand the shock, and believes in it, and can't, wait, be baptized through a hole in ice." His advice to invalids is, "Wait till the birds sing."

DR. RUFUS ANDERSON'S HISTORY OF MISSIONS, and especially his late work in two volumes giving the history of missions in Asia Minor, comprise a great deal of information with which the world generally ought to be more familiar. The great obstacle to the conversion of Mohammedans to Christianity is the miserable type of Oriental Christianity with which they are familiar, and which they have learned to despise. Dr. Anderson describes the mission to the Oriental churches from the American Foreign Missionary Society, prosecuted through a period of fifty years, and the new life which has been made to pulsate through them. It was a grandly conceived plan to convert nominal and merely ritualistic Christians to real Christianity as the first step towards converting heathens and infidels. The work done in the Nestorian Church imbosomed in Moslemism is of great interest. The light which these volumes give us of the state of society in the East, of the condition of the Greek Church, of the prospect which opens for the cause of living Christianity, of the condition and prospects of Mohammedanism, makes them of more interest than any books of travel. Moreover, the missionary life and character are depicted. If any one has got the impression that missionaries are a class of men who are sent off to the heathen because of too little mental calibre to succeed at

home, let him read these volumes and find his mistake. Among no class of men shall we find a loftier manhood united with a more sublime spirit of self-sacrifice, nowhere more intellectual and moral energy, penetrated and sanctified by a diviner love. The names of King, Grant, Perkins, Parsons, and a score like them, are not even known to the world at large, much less do they win its applause; but as recorded on high there are none that shine with a purer lustre.

A BAPTIST MINISTER who preached in Washington is reported as making a very sweeping application of his sermon. He quoted the line from Pope, "An honest man's the noblest work of God,"—then made a long and solemn pause, and after looking inquisitively about him, and specially perhaps towards one end of Pennsylvania Avenue, declared, "I don't believe God Almighty has had a job in this city for fifteen years." Such generalization was almost as bad as David's,— "I said in my haste all men are liars." Exceptions ought to be made.

WHO WILL GO? Stanley, in search of Livingstone, says he fell upon some people easy of access, occupying some of the highlands of eastern Africa, whose climate was delightful and healthful, which abounded in delicious tropical productions,—people whose manners were mild and friendly, and who would be ready to be moulded in the hands of the Christian missionary who would visit them. This is the picture he draws,—

"Four days by steamer (up the Wami River from the coast of Zanzibar) bring the missionary to the healthy uplands of Africa, where he can live among the gentle Wasagara without fear or alarm; where he can enjoy the luxuries of civilized life without fear of being deprived of them, amid the most picturesque scenes a poetic fancy could imagine! Here is the greenest verdure, purest water; here are valleys teeming with grain stalks, forests of tamarind, mimosa, gum-copal tree; here is the gigantic mvule, the stately mparamusi, the beautiful palm,—a scene which only a tropic sky covers. Health and abundance of food are assured to the missionary; gentle people are at his feet ready to welcome him! Except civilized society, nothing that the soul of man can desire is lacking here.

"From the village of Kadetamare a score of admirable mission sites are available, with fine health-giving breezes blowing over them, water in abundance at their feet, fertility unsurpassed around them, with docile, good-tempered people dwelling everywhere, at peace with each other and all travelers and neighbors.

"As the passes of Olympus unlocked the gates of the Eastern Empire

to the hordes of Othman ; as the passes of Kumayli and Suru admitted the British into Abyssinia, — so the passes of Mukondokwa may admit the gospel into the heart of savage Africa."

It should be added that the slave-trade is carried on extensively from the coast of Zanzibar, and that to carry the gospel into the heart of savage Africa, or into these regions whose people and scenery so charmed the eye of Mr. Stanley, would insure the suppression of the traffic and the slave-marts. Who will leave the intractable parishes at home that refuse to be more than half Christianized, and carry the glad tidings to people ready to welcome the message, and be moulded into forms of Christian civilization, and so make the heart of Africa a centre of radiating light? There is no doubt — for history shows it — that the African mind is more tractable than the Anglo Saxon under the plastic power of the gospel.

THE DOGMATISM OF SCIENTISTS AND THE DOGMATISM OF THEOLOGIANs are about upon a par. Whoever wishes to read the argument of one who has studied both science and theology, with a mind leaning candidly to the discoveries and reasonings of both, should be acquainted with the writings of the Duke of Argyll, — especially a little book entitled "Primeval Man, an Examination of Some Recent Speculations." The antiquity of the race in agreement with the Bible chronology, so far as the Bible has any chronology ; the reasons for the unity of the race, and its radiation from a common centre and origin ; the impossibility of development from lower species ; the weight of argument in favor of the theory that the savage state is a fall or descent from one of primitive purity and enlightenment, against the theory that the savage state was the primitive one ; with the refutation of the theories of the scientists of the Darwinian school, who get beyond their province and give speculation in the place of science, and in defiance of facts, — all is argued with admirable candor, and from purely scientific ground.

"DID YOU CRY?" said a good mother to her little girl, who had fallen down and hurt her badly. "No, I didn't." "But why didn't you?" "'Cause there wan't anybody to hear me." A great many older people cry for other people to hear, not from any subjective necessities of the case. Their groans are piteous when they have an auditory, but cease suddenly when they find themselves alone.

The power of will, whose strength generally measures the amount of one's manhood or womanhood, is developed by choking down complaints, and summoning the latent energies into new manifestation.

HENRY M. STANLEY'S BOOK — "How I Found Livingstone" — comes out a bulky volume of over seven hundred pages. Its really valuable matter might have been put into half that space. Mr. Stanley never loses sight of Mr. Stanley as a most extraordinary hero; but the reader readily forgives the egotism, considering the romance of the achievement. The narrative is vastly interesting, and gives much information touching the tribes of central and eastern Africa and the natural resources of the country. And whoever has a heart to admire Quixotic adventure, Yankee pluck, unbounded resource under difficulties, and how egotism and self-assurance may be utilized so as to command respect and obedience from savage men, let him follow Stanley from Zanzibar to Ujiji and back again. The miracles wrought by mind over muscle, and over nature, with her lagoons, jungles, rivers, wild beasts, and wild men, will make the journey a very lively and exciting one. Mr. Stanley failed as a lecturer. As a writer he shows himself well skilled in the art of picturesque description, though a few lessons in the art of condensation would greatly improve his style.

THE REPORT OF THE POLAND COMMITTEE is anxiously looked for. When it comes we hope it will discriminate between intentional corruption and sluggishness of conscience. There are a great many men who would never consciously sell their votes, who nevertheless are not of such immaculate virtue as our two Massachusetts Senators — God be praised for them! — as to keep themselves clear of any bargains or speculations that may possibly bring public duty and self-interest in conflict with each other.

HENRY WARD BEECHER ON THE FUTURE LIFE. In one of his lecture-room talks Mr. Beecher says his impression is very decided "that there is no intermediate state, and that there is no ground for believing in one in the texts of Scripture." Strangely enough he quotes, in this very connection, Paul's emphatic language to the Thessalonians: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent (antici-

pate) them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout (loud summons), with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air (the lower heaven), and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

What was the trouble that afflicted the believers at Thessalonica? Plainly this: They believed that the second coming of Christ was at hand, and that it was to be with such transforming power that the saints then living would be received by him directly into heaven. But how with those dear friends who had already died, and would not be alive on the earth to meet him? *They* would be absent. This was the sorrow of the saints at Thessalonica: we shall meet the Lord, but not our departed friends. Be comforted, Paul tells them. Those who have fallen asleep in Christ he will "bring with him." Bring with him from where? From heaven? That was the very place their surviving friends were going to. Plainly those who had "fallen asleep" were to come from an intermediate state, out of which they were to be raised to meet their friends in heaven. This intermediate state was *Hades*, neither heaven nor hell, but preliminary to either, — as Dr. Campbell has abundantly proved. And that "the dead in Christ" were to come out of this state at the first resurrection Paul himself has not merely hinted, but declared; for in his great chapter on this subject, after describing the resurrection, its nature and process, he exclaims in triumph, — so his words ought to have been rendered, — "O HADES! where is thy victory?"

THE ARGUMENT FOR THE DEATH PENALTY is that there are men in the world so bad that they are dangerous here, and we must hurry them off into another. Did it ever occur to these reasoners that these bad men may be just as dangerous in that other world as they are in this, and just as troublesome to its peace and safety? What should we say of the State of New York if it made a Botany Bay of Massachusetts, and sent its thieves and murderers hither for us to take care of? Or what should we say if the other world projected all its worst devils into this in order to be rid of them? Why, we should say it was a shameful invasion of our jurisdiction. Why the argument should not work both ways we never could see. And though society here on the earth may not yet have virtue enough, or moral and spiritual power enough as yet, to take care of its own wicked, it is a shameful confession of weakness, pusi-

lanimity, and bankruptcy in moral and spiritual force ; for the appliances of religion, education, and philanthropy, especially among the children of neglect, poverty, ignorance, and sensuality, should be such as to render the death penalty unnecessary. And then we should come clearly and inevitably to the doctrine that each world is bound to take care of its own wicked ; to restrain them and reform them, if reformation be possible ; and that only the Lord himself has the sovereignty over life and death, or any right to say when this probation shall close or one world be exchanged for another.

THE NEGRO MINSTRELS ARE COMING, with their wild, weird, witching melodies. A thousand years of oppression and sorrow wail through them on the minor key. Humor, pathos, and a most heart-breaking tenderness are often found blending together, and they take the heart with a storm of emotions : pity, grief, terror. sympathy mingle together, not without a tinge of grotesque humor. The minstrels start from the Hampton School (Virginia), where they have been trained and prepared for their mission, and we understand are to be in Boston ere long. The following is one of their lyrics, which, if it make you smile in reading, it will make you cry in hearing it. It is the negro rendering of the resurrection.

" IN DAT GREAT GITTIN'-UP MORNIN'.

" 1. I'm going to tell you 'bout de coming of de Saviour, —
Fare you well, fare you well.

I'm going to tell you 'bout de coming of de Saviour, —
Fare you well, fare you well.

Chorus. — In dat great gittin'-up mornin', —
Fare you well, fare you well.

In dat great gittin'-up mornin', —
Fare you well, fare you well.

" 2. Dere's a better day a comin'.

3. When my Lord speaks to his Father,

4. Says, Father, I'm tired o' bearin',

5. Tired o' bearin' for poor sinners,

6. Preachers, fold your Bibles,

7. For de last soul's converted,

8. Prayer-makers, pray no more.

9. De Lord spoke to Gabriel,

10. Say, go look behind de altar,

11. Take down de silver trumpet,

12. Go down to de sea-side,

13. Place one foot on de dry land,

14. Place de other on de sea,

15. Raise your hand to heaven,
16. Declare by your Maker,
17. Dat time shall be no longer.
28. Blow your trumpet, Gabriel.
19. Lord, how loud shall I blow it?
20. Blow it right calm and easy,
21. Do not alarm my people,
22. Tell dem to come to judgment.
23. Den you see de coffins bustin',
24. Den you see de Christians risin',
25. Den you see de righteous marchin',
26. Dey are marchin' home to heaven.
27. Den look upon Mount Zion,
28. You see my Jesus comin',
29. With all his holy angels.
30. Where you runnin', sinner?
31. Judgment day is coming.
32. Gabriel, blow your trumpet.
33. Lord, how loud shall I blow it?
34. Loud as seven peals o' thunder,
35. Wake de sleepin' nations.
36. Den you see poor sinners risin',
37. See de dry bones a creepin',
38. Den you see de world on fire,
39. You see de moon a bleedin',
40. See de stars a fallin',
41. See de elements meltin',
42. See de forked lightnin',
43. Hear de rumblin' thunder.
44. Earth shall reel an' totter,
45. Hell shall be uncapped,
46. De dragon shall be loosened.
47. Fare ye well, poor sinner.
48. Den you look up in de heaven,
49. See your mother in heaven,
50. While your're doomed to destruction.
51. When de partin' word is given,
52. De Christian shouts to your ruin.
53. No mercy'll ever reach you,
54. But you'll cry out for cold water,
55. While de Christian's shoutin' in glory,
56. Sayin' amen to your damnation,
57. Den you hear the sinner sayin',
58. Down I'm rollin', down I'm rollin'.
59. Den de righteous housed in heaven,
60. Live with God forever."

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE PERFECT LIFE. In Twelve Discourses. By Willam Ellery Channing. Edited from his Manuscripts by his nephew, William Henry Channing. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

These sermons carry us back to the days when we used to walk in from Cambridge to hear Channing preach. We think we can recognize one of them as it was first delivered in the calm, earnest, and silvery tones of the preacher. To us this volume has a value such as does not attach to his occasional and controversial discourses. They give us Channing as he appeared from Sabbath to Sabbath to his own people, and communed with them on his favorite themes. The thread of unity that runs through the volume is rather loose; but Channing's great and favorite theme — the capacities of human nature, the means through which it rises towards perfection, and the power and worth of Christianity as adapted to that end is set forth in Channing's own style, always transparent and always mellow and blood-warm, with passages that rise into fervid eloquence. Radicalism will look in vain for any countenance from this volume. The Divine Personality and the Divine personal relations with the individual are set forth, and are the farthest possible from all pantheistic tendencies. The character and works of Christ as a revelation both of perfect humanity and the perfect Divinity, the miracles of the New Testament as important history and as showing the power of spirit over matter, all are emphasized and exhibited with characteristic power and clearness. The discourses are conservative of the highest truths. Their publication is timely, and they will command universal interest. S.

HOMES AND HOSPITALS, or Two Phases of Woman's Work as exhibited in the Labors of Amy Dutton and Agnes E. Jones. Cambridge: Riverside Press.

These two memoirs ought to stimulate every young woman who can use her time and strength outside of nearer claims to go and do likewise. One plan may be the better for some persons, the second for others; but no one can read the book without some good effect.